

Appendix

International Payments Imbalances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks apropos the minority views expressed by myself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS,
New York, N.Y., September 14, 1961.
The Honorable PRESCOTT BUSH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have called my attention to your separate views on the 1961 report of the Senate Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments dealing with international payments imbalances.

Confidence is the touchstone of currency. With it a currency weak when measured in orthodox terms may survive. Without it, a strong currency can be toppled like a house of cards.

As in many fields of human endeavor, room for improvement exists in methods available to meet imbalances in foreign payments. It is commendable that serious study is given to this problem by the subcommittee and others knowledgeable in this field.

Procedures proved worthy of reliance in intranation history deserve close scrutiny as a foundation of devising successful measures for handling adequately international balances of payments. But they undoubtedly require suitable adaptation to take into cognizance the differences between economic and political factors within a single nation and those prevailing in dealings among nations. As history has demonstrated, patriotism can be a most powerful force in dealing on the intranational plane, but its value is dissipated when transactions move into the international field.

In our lifetime considerable experience has been had with voluntary organizations working in the field of international relations. Evolutionary improvement rather than revolutionary panaceas appears to point the way to such success as has been achieved in this area. Such an approach seems also least likely to disturb that confidence upon which international monetary success depends.

Therefore the note of caution expressed in your individual views on the subcommittee report is worthy of careful attention. Your position seems to envision not a do-nothing policy, but a do-it-right policy.

I am forwarding the report to NAMSB headquarters with the suggestion that the substance of your views be invited to the attention of the NAMSB membership. For

certainly as to the mutual savings banking industry, if confidence falls in our monetary system, the industry cannot survive.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. MCKENNA,
Director-Counsel.

Residual Oil Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Charles F. Avila, president of the Boston Edison Co., together with letters which that company directed to the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization concerning the residual oil problem:

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
Boston, Mass., September 12, 1961.
The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. LANE: I enclose for your information copies of letters sent by Boston Edison Co. to the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization concerning the residual oil problem.

In our letter of July 20, 1961, we also endorsed the joint statement filed by the New England Council and the Oil Users Association—a clear, factual, and convincing presentation of New England's case. The letter dated August 18, 1961, is our rebuttal to statements made by those who favor import controls on residual oil. As you are aware, these quotas impose an unfair economic penalty on the people of New England as well as other areas of the country.

Thank you for your active support on this issue. I hope that your continued efforts will result in the removal of these costly restrictions.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES F. AVILA.

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
Boston, Mass., July 20, 1961.

Mr. FRANK B. ELLIS,
Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: Boston Edison Co. endorses the statement filed jointly by the New England Council and the Oil Users Association on the question of residual oil and national security. This letter is a supplement to that statement. Its purpose is to emphasize the particular problems faced by this company, one of the largest public utilities in the Nation serving a population of over 1.5 million.

Boston Edison Co. is a large, normal user of residual oil. Its use of this fuel in large quantities started in 1950 when residual oil accounted for 85 percent of its fuel requirements. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 1961, this company used in excess

of 7 million barrels of residual oil for the production of electricity distributed in 40 cities and towns in the greater Boston area and for steam for space heating in downtown Boston.

Increases and decreases in the cost of fuel directly affect the bill of each customer. Oil price increases resulting from restrictions have cost our customers almost \$2 million. Greater damage to them is threatened by continuance of present governmental policies.

Nowhere and in no way is this fact of threatened damage more starkly evident than in the effect of present import restrictions upon the company's commercial relationship with its fuel suppliers. A critical problem—and one basis for the company's strenuous objection to these restrictions—is that, wholly because of such restrictions, the company is prevented from changing from one supplier to another as economy or best business practice might at any time indicate. We are denied such flexibility no matter how harshly we might at any time be treated by a supplier with regard to price or service. Suppliers hold import quotas by virtue of their customers' use of oil as recorded for the year 1957. This effectively prevents us from turning to new sources of supply even if indicated by prudent business policy. Such a restriction and elimination of choice is actually a clear restraint of trade.

Allocations of residual oil by any method, and particularly the one now in effect, have caused a dislocation in the amount of oil available to various regions of the country. Eight out of ten integrated companies recently granted increased allocations as newcomers do not market residual in New England. The concurrent reduction in supply to traditional New England suppliers, it is estimated, will result in a 5-million-barrel supply deficit to New England by the third quarter of 1961.

Restrictions are a deterrent to the industrial growth of the area we serve. If this extensive and important area is to grow industrially, to provide a steady increasing number of jobs for its expanding population and to meet the requirements of a time of national emergency, it must be assured of an ample and certain supply of fuel, a supply available at the lowest possible cost.

Our case on this issue is also the case for New England.

No useful consideration or assessment of our national security is possible without equal attention and study being given the needs, the problems, and the resources—or the lack of them—of the Nation's several geographical regions. As the whole is no greater than the sum of its parts, so the Nation's strength is no greater than the particular strength of each such region.

The statement and its documentation filed by the New England Council places full emphasis upon the national security aspects of this critical problem. Although pertinent reference is made throughout to the New England aspects of that problem, it is most important that this statement be received and considered as reflecting equally New England's stake in an amended policy.

New England has no indigenous fuel production, has found 20 percent of its entire energy consumption deriving from residual oil (a percentage increasing each year), has

been forced by the limitations established to pay unjustifiably high prices for its fuel, has seen such prices steadily rise higher in the New England region than elsewhere, has found its people and industries forced to needless and costly expenditure of millions of dollars per year, has in this, as in many other instances, been victimized by transportation cost differentials, has questioned the validity of each of the arguments advanced in behalf of the coal industry, not alone from the standpoint of excessive costs to New England consumers but as regards national security as well, submits that the national security is never better served or even well served when one of our country's principal geographical regions finds its millions of residents forced to needless expenditure, its vital industries compelled to compete unfairly and thereby become less productive, and its economy steadily weakened by such drains upon it.

The case for New England—the case for the Boston Edison Co.—deserves the most careful and comprehensive study by those authorized, to eliminate a problem that present policy has created.

Thank you for your consideration of these views.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES F. AVILA.

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
Boston, Mass., August 18, 1961.

MR. FRANK B. ELLIS,
Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: We would like to comment on some of the statements made to you in support of import restrictions on residual fuel oil.

The National Coal Association has advocated a policy of severely restricting all imports of residual oil primarily on the basis that foreign fuel supplies, particularly from the Caribbean, are unusually vulnerable to interruption and would be cut off in time of war.

Such a policy, we submit, would actually result in the dissipation of our economic and industrial strength; reduce our chances of winning the present cold war; would alienate some of our closest allies in the Western Hemisphere, namely, Canada, Mexico, Venezuela, and the West Indies, and would be a great handicap in any future war.

The residual oil import restriction program has caused shortages and increased costs to residual oil users by \$174 million annually. To that extent the ability of the United States to produce goods and services at low cost has been unnecessarily weakened. The cold war is a war of economic survival. We cannot win such a war by acceding to the narrow interest of individual industries, by adopting an isolationist philosophy, or by hurting friendly nations.

Our foreign trade, foreign investment, and military strategy are based on an interdependent world. We helped organize NATO and SEATO. We have military bases throughout the world and are committed to a global defense strategy and not "head in the sand" defeatism. To argue that under any war assumptions that we cannot keep our sea lanes open is contrary to the mobilization planning of those responsible for the defense of our country and repugnant to a nation which is spending over \$45 billion a year for defense purposes.

Global warfare requires foreign supplies of strategic materials such as residual oil. The greater the number of sources and supply routes that exist the greater are our chances of victory. It makes little sense to propose that the best way to assure open supply lines in time of war is to dry them up in time of peace.

The NCA concept of a submarine blockade assumes that tankers carrying residual oil will be targets in the next war. No mention

is made of colliers, tankers carrying crude and other products, military supplies or troops. Neither is any recognition given to improvement in antisubmarine warfare techniques which have kept pace with the growth of foreign submarine fleets.

Certainly, if tankers cannot get to New England, Florida, and Hawaii, neither can colliers. If tankers are stopped from making the trip from the Persian Gulf to the United States, our slow moving colliers now carrying coal to Europe will be unable to continue to do so. Furthermore, in the guided missile age, dispersion of fuel supplies and a large tanker fleet offer a greater guarantee of fuel supply continuity than coal coming through fixed-target rail bottlenecks at Hampton Roads or Mechanicsville, N.Y., the rail junction connecting New England with Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

The NCA has also made claims of financial distress in the coal industry but has not submitted any conclusive evidence that this is so. The table on page 34 of its statement combines both profits and losses for individual companies. Any evaluation of the financial successes of the industry would have to show the performance of the leading producers. Financial data for these companies for the years 1959 and 1960 are available. This data should be analyzed as these producers are the ones which would benefit from any increased use of coal. Residual oil is not in competition with coal produced by marginal mines.

On page 44 of its statement the NCA offers the thesis that residual is injurious to the coal industry because they are in competition for the same general type of market.

Residual oil has been marketed ever since oil has been refined and no one will argue that it is not in competition with other industrial energy and fuels including gas, electricity, coal, hydropower, and the atom. We observe, however, that competition and injury are not synonymous; that injury does not necessarily follow from competition. The improvements in efficiency that the bituminous industry has achieved have been the result of competition.

There is little evidence that residual imports have had a material effect on the domestic oil industry. The Independent Petroleum Association is primarily concerned with the fact that removal of import restrictions on residual might result in large quantities of this product being used as refinery feed stock. It would seem that this could be adequately provided for under the import program even if restrictions on residual used as fuel were removed.

Standard Oil of Indiana, a large quota holder, anticipates that with removal of restrictions the price of residual would drop to such a low price that it would greatly accelerate installation of conversion units in refineries with a resulting reduction in domestic residual production. It is hard for us to understand the logic of this argument since many refiners have profitably made these installations both before and after import controls as is shown by the continuous decline in the domestic yield. We do not understand how the price of residual with controls removed could drop more than the amount it has risen since controls were instituted.

We in New England are fully aware of the plight of some segments of the railroad industry. Distress where it does exist results from loss of revenue to other forms of transportation and not to loss of coal revenue. It is surprising to us that the coal-carrying railroads would make an argument for a product they themselves no longer find economical to use. Are we seriously to consider the proposal that New England, Florida, and Hawaii be forced to burn an uneconomical fuel but not the railroads, so that the coal-carrying and oil-burning railroads can improve their operating results?

In conclusion we would like to draw attention to the following:

1. The coal industry has mechanized itself to its economic advantage.
2. The railroad industry has turned from coal to diesel fuel to its economic advantage.
3. The domestic refiners have reduced the yield of residual oil to their economic advantage.
4. Our allies in Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean have increased the production of residual to their economic advantage.
5. Industry in New England, Florida, and other parts of the country has turned to residual to its economic advantage.
6. All of these developments taken together have strengthened our Nation's economy and security.

And now under the guise of national security, coal, and the coal-carrying railroads want oil users to reverse course to their economic disadvantage.

We again urge that OCDM consider the great damage the restriction program has caused to areas which have adapted themselves to the use of residual oil in order to offset real geographical disadvantages. We respectfully recommend that the present program be rescinded.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES F. AVILA.

Business-Education Cooperation and Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

MR. WILEY. Mr. President, in an increasingly complex age, research plays a key role in progress.

In business, industry, farming, science, technology—in all fields—the formulas for forward steps come to a great extent from the laboratory.

Unfortunately, research is very expensive. For this reason, it has become necessary to find ways in which to minimize the cost, for example, by spreading it among interested parties.

In Wisconsin, we have a splendid record of research between business and our educational institutions. At the University of Wisconsin, for instance, a splendid record of such cooperation has been established. Recently the Milwaukee Sentinel published a fine article on the way in which such cooperation is helping to create breakthroughs in a great many fields. Reflecting a fine example of the kind of cooperation that can speed progress elsewhere in the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY BACKS UW RESEARCH

MADISON, July 15.—Research in engineering and commerce and related fields at the University of Wisconsin has been and is of great value to industry and business of Milwaukee and of Wisconsin and the Nation.

Of so much value that industry and business of the Milwaukee area, of the State, and

of the Nation have liberally rallied to its support.

And the research covers a wide variety of fields, ranging from basic studies in chemical kinetics, thermodynamics, and spray drying, to a study of Great Lakes ports and shipping and research on the economic influences of Latin American countries.

Much of the research being done by members of the faculty and staff of the University of Wisconsin College of Engineering and School of Commerce is supported by grants and awards by industry and business foundations and by private industry and business.

Some of these grants and awards are purely for research. Others are to support fellowships and scholarships in advanced research studies. All are very helpful to the advancement of knowledge and the training of young researchers in engineering, commerce, science and allied fields.

GIVE OVER \$2 MILLION

During the 1959-60 fiscal year, the latest for which figures are now complete, industry and business throughout the Nation contributed \$2,034,855 to research and education at the University of Wisconsin, of which leading Wisconsin industrial business contributed \$198,082.16.

Among the largest Wisconsin industry-business supporters of advanced research and education at the University of Wisconsin in 1959-60 were Oscar Mayer and Co., Madison; the Johnson Foundation of Racine; the Wisconsin Utilities Association; the Wisconsin Mutual Insurance Alliance; Baker Laboratories, Inc., East Troy; Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., West Allis; Nekoosa-Edwards Foundation, Inc., Nekoosa, and the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Allen-Bradley Co. and the A. O. Smith Corp., all of Milwaukee.

What are their grants of funds paying for in research and education at Wisconsin's university?

START OF INDUSTRY

Take a look at engineering, for example.

Basic research in chemical kinetics, thermodynamics, heat transmission, gas absorption and other fields have resulted in the saving of many millions of dollars in process design and years of time in pilot plant development for many chemical industries, both in Wisconsin and throughout the world.

The dry cell industry in Wisconsin grew out of original work by C. F. Burgess in the university's chemical engineering department, as did the hot nickel plating bath—which was given outright to industry by its inventor, Prof. O. P. Watts. This latter discovery is now universally used, and the plating industries have officially acknowledged that the savings to them total millions of dollars.

For the first time, chemical principles controlling reactions between melting-furnace atmospheres, the metal charge, combustion gases, certain slags, and the molten metal have been quantitatively established. These principles have given chemical analysis control during melting a scientific and engineering basis that is practiced wherever these alloys are melted. Principles defining the properties of molding sand aggregates and, in addition, principles of molding methods have been worked out and the information has been distributed by the Department of Mining and Metallurgy to foundries throughout the United States.

Research in the University of Wisconsin Department of Mining and Metallurgy on the workability of brittle materials has opened the way for industrial applications in the fabrication of cermets (ceramic-metal combinations) which are the ultrahigh temperature structural materials of the immediate future. It is also possible that this research will provide a new and easy method of producing large crystals of transistor materials.

The initial cost of the University of Wisconsin's network calculator, about \$240,000 was borne entirely by the Wisconsin Utilities Association.

Engineers within the several power companies use the calculator to study their systems periodically to insure adequate capacity in advance. Various alternative means for expanding capacity can be studied economically and the less desirable alternatives eliminated. The result is improved power service to the State.

INDUSTRY UTILIZES FINDINGS

An internal combustion engines project in the University of Wisconsin Department of Mechanical Engineering, originally begun in the 1930's, is concerned with combustion in compression-ignition, spark-ignition, and jet engines. Findings of the project have been utilized throughout the industry. They include data obtained during studies of ignition, duration of combustion, flame temperatures and pressures, vaporization of fuel, cylinder wall temperatures, and rates of heat transfer.

Jet engine studies have dealt with the effects of preheating the fuel, determination of rate of vaporization of single fuel droplets, and studies of drop sizes and drop distribution in sprays.

Many students dating from as early as 1916 have been concerned with air movement within many types of buildings, including infiltration, ventilation, air distribution, temperature gradients from floor to ceiling, characteristics of various types of air inlets and outlets, and the performance of turning devices and grilles. This research at Wisconsin has contributed significantly to improving building construction, reducing costs, and increasing comfort of occupants.

A spray drier designed and built on the basis of research conducted over the past several years in the engineering experiment station is providing much information of value to the agricultural experiment station scientists, who are advising commercial manufacturers of dried milk products and other dried foods.

The drier installation, some 50 feet high, gives scientists an opportunity to expand their research in this field from pilot-model to large-scale operation, and promises to be highly effective in aid of the milk processing industries.

Or take a look at research in the University of Wisconsin School of Commerce.

A study of "The Adequacy of the Retirement Program from the Viewpoint of the Old Worker," supported by a \$250,000 grant by the Ford Foundation, is considering pensions and other financial aspects, job opportunities, and mobility of the aged worker.

A center for productivity motivation was recently established under a \$100,000 grant by the Johnson Foundation, Racine. The center is investigating the factors, other than improved technology, affecting productivity in business and industry.

HANDLE WBA PROJECT

Then there is research in supervising projects in the area of life insurance securities and management of bank resources.

The research on valuation requirements for life insurance company security holdings, supported by a \$100,000 grant from the Life Insurance Association of America, is nearing completion. A second study, undertaken in association with the Wisconsin Bankers Association, will aid banks in planning solvency and liquidity in management of resources.

The university has recently published a series of 11 vacation-recreation studies which provide evidence of the significance of the various phases of the tourist industry and its impact on the economy of the State. The studies are financed by a \$25,000 appropriation by the 1959 State legislature.

A U.S. Labor Department program on

"Manpower Challenges the 1960's" is underway. Community and statewide meetings of businessmen, educators, and personnel men will relate national manpower and labor prospects in the 1960's to what is happening on the local level.

A "Symposium on Workmen's Compensation Insurance in a Dynamic Society" was held at the university last May in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first legislation in the area of workmen's compensation insurance by the State of Wisconsin. Leaders from business, industrial commissions, insurance, labor, medicine, and the National Safety Council participated in the symposium.

The Great Lakes general cargo ports within the State, Green Bay, Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Superior, are being studied along with Chicago through a questionnaire inventory of the facilities, estimate of the tonnage capacity, and the potential cargo traffic by 1965.

Development for Wisconsin administrators of a program of the National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, in cooperation with the college of agriculture, is supported by a Kellogg grant of \$800,000.

Other research includes a study of economic influences in the Latin American countries, a new field of international trade in the University of Wisconsin School of Commerce; a study of financial controls, supported by a \$10,000 grant by General Electric; operations research, and a highway study.

Major publications by the University of Wisconsin Bureau of Business Research and Service released during the past year include "Property Taxation and the Wisconsin Tax System," by the Wisconsin Business Research Council and the Committee for Economic Development; a report of an extensive study for the U.S. Senate subcommittee which investigated insurance regulations and practices; "The Second Midwest Newsprint Survey"; and the first two of five volumes consisting of papers delivered at the "Symposium of Insurance and Government" held at the university last September.

Khrushchev Another Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Henry J. Taylor, in yesterday's Washington Daily News, embarrassingly reveals the double standard the "agrarian reformers" around President Kennedy use in their approach to Dictator Khrushchev. As Mr. Taylor states, there really is no difference between dictators despite the fact that one wears a brown shirt and the other wears a red shirt. When this similarity is admitted by those around the President, perhaps we can approach our problems with the Russian tyrant in the way that made the United States the country that it is—no appeasement.

Here is the article:

A PROFOUND DISSERVICE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

President Kennedy voiced a note of injury and surprise, as did his chief negotiator at Geneva, when the Kremlin broke its word and resumed bomb tests. His tone left millions discouraged who never should have been encouraged in the first place.

When will our public be permitted to know that it is only our officials who put some store in such talkathons, not the Communists? Communists always behave like Communists, and thus have no intention whatever of reducing world tensions or dropping their toolkit of threats to mankind. And even if they did make a salutary agreement about anything, they would break it 10 seconds after it had served a Red purpose.

Somehow we never seem to realize where the Devil keeps his tail. Once more we lost much weight in Russian eyes by allowing them to toy with us like a dancing mouse at Geneva. We should have halted the fandango months ago when the Russians made their indifference crystal clear instead of pleading and pleading with them to keep talking.

We failed to carry our flag correctly because, once more, we failed to face up to realities and because our officials prize so highly the appearance of success in their negotiations even when none exists or is reasonably possible.

This preoccupation with appearances instead of realities is a profound disservice to America's world position and, therefore, to our security and world peace, because it dulls our public's understanding of Communist implacableness and at the same time whets the Reds' appetite for greater and greater demands. We are laid open to the same tactics that Hitler used which led to Munich.

This dangerous and immature behavior is rooted in the lingering and fatuous idea that somehow we can make a safe accommodation with the Communists whereas we realized such was never in the cards with the Nazis. This is a way to volunteer our neck for the hangman's noose.

It is utterly mystifying why many intellectuals and Washington officials who saw nazism's menace early and clearly and reacted intelligently are thrown off the track now that the Soviet Union is involved in the same practices. A child should be able to see the brown shirts have merely been dyed red. Hitler and Khrushchev are Siamese twins, but notice how differently our policy treats one from the other.

Had President Roosevelt even suggested sound agreements could be achieved with the Nazis he would have been castigated for giving us a dangerously misleading interpretation of the true nature of the Nazi menace. Countless organizations would have called for his scalp, he would have dangled in effigy in a dozen towns, and his political future would have disappeared like butter in a blast furnace.

Yet, today Washington officialdom often behaves as if the Communists are different. Then, right on schedule, Khrushchev pulls the rug out from under us each time and, once more, our officials are "disappointed" or "surprised" when he does it.

Aid for Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the consideration of our international economic policies, stress must be placed on the encouragement of exports and assistance to our businessmen. The program of the Department of Commerce

functions in this area in such promotional activities as trade centers, fairs, missions, surveys, and commercial intelligence operations.

L. Edward Scriven, Director of the Office of International Trade Fairs, described these services in an address to the Tulsa World Trade Committee, Tulsa, Okla., July 26, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that his address on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELL ABROAD

(Address by M. L. Edward Scriven, Director, Office of International Trade Fairs, U.S. Department of Commerce, before the Tulsa World Trade Committee, Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, Tulsa, Okla., July 25, 1961)

I've been barnstorming around the country, telling businessmen of the advantages to be gained by working with the Office of International Trade Fairs. They can be summed up in two words, "more sales."

It's surprising to me that American businessmen don't know more about our program. When I was in business, if someone had walked into my office and said he'd help me find new markets and sell my products, I'd have sat him down in the best chair in my office and given him a cigar and then taken him to lunch.

But I'm not asking for that—although I do appreciate the fine lunch you've served here. What I'm asking for is 25 minutes of your time to tell you what your Government is doing to help you sell overseas.

MORE AMERICAN COMPANIES NEED TO LEARN ABOUT INTERNATIONAL TRADE

First of all, consider the fact that only about 12,000 of America's 300,000 manufacturers are now exporting their products. Then consider the vast new markets that are opening up right now—in Africa, in the Middle East, in the Pacific, and a revitalized Europe.

These are terrific markets, gentlemen. And if we Americans don't sell them, someone else will.

The British, the Germans, the Japanese—not to mention the Russians and the Communist Chinese—are all conducting hard-hitting trade promotion programs.

We are too, and I'll tell you more about our program in a minute.

But first, let me give you a quote from President Kennedy's message urging businessmen to recapture the spirit and vitality of the traders of old. He said: "New frontiers lie beyond our borders that must be explored and developed by all energetic and resourceful businessmen. New markets for our goods and services are emerging in the developing areas which are now joining the world community for free nations. Also, the traditional foreign markets offer challenging opportunities as a result of their growing economies and elimination of restrictions affecting American goods."

The point I'm trying to make here today is that we're not in this export business for profits alone, but for survival.

The sooner all of us realize that the economic front is one of the hottest fronts in the cold war, the better off we'll be.

NEW COUNTRIES—NEW OPPORTUNITIES

For instance, take the newly emerging West African country of Ghana. We'll be holding our first trade exhibition there in November. We want their business, sure. And we think there's plenty of business potential there, from building block factories to Go-Karts. But more important, we want their friendship. And the history of the British Empire has taught us that trade ties lead to international cooperation, and mutual respect.

SOLID SALES RESULT

Take another example. We produced a trade exhibition 2 months ago in Helsinki, Finland, a country with which I'm familiar because I lived there for several years. My Finnish friends told me that the people there were delighted that we came—delighted because it showed them that the United States is taking a continuing friendly interest in their country and their future.

Besides friendship, Helsinki gave us something else—\$3 million worth of solid sales, sales that mean jobs for Americans, and sales that help keep our gold balance on an even keel.

The same story has held true elsewhere. An exhibitor at an OITF exhibition early this year in Colombo, Ceylon, said it was: "A dramatic and forceful way to bring the truth about America to this small island nation, but at the same time promote our foreign commerce." The man could have added that he sold three complete commercial laundry and dry cleaning shops as a result of his participation.

A midwestern manufacturer of machine tools tells us that since he participated in a series of OITF industrial exhibitions in India, he is getting across-the-board orders from that part of the world.

If manufacturers can get results like these from U.S. trade fairs, why don't they enter the program? First—and this is something we in the Commerce Department are trying to do something about—not enough businessmen know about the trade fairs program. Second, as a New York businessman said to me not long ago, perhaps we're not hungry enough.

In the last year and a half, only one Oklahoma business has participated in the trade fairs program. The Phillips Petroleum Co. of Bartlesville displayed a sampling of its large petroleum and petrochemical product line in fairs at Izmir, Turkey, and Casablanca, Morocco.

WE WANT TO HELP SMALL BUSINESSES

We in the United States are proud of our vast petroleum and petrochemical industry, which has produced so many products contributing to our high standard of living. But we are especially interested in encouraging and helping smaller companies who have yet to learn the possibilities of international trade.

We'd like the people of other nations to see the advances that have been made in the United States. Many of them have started in Tulsa—perhaps in this room. And while we're showing the people of the world what Oklahoma businessmen have done, we'd like to help many smaller Oklahoma businesses sell.

WHERE FUTURE FAIRS ARE SCHEDULED

While I'm here, I want to mention some of our prospective 1962 fair sites. Tripoli, Baghdad, Mexico City, Casablanca, Izmir, Damascus, and Cairo—these are places well-known to oilmen. They're the commercial centers for areas which have vast underground oil deposits. And, as we've found in the past, many of them are lively, expanding markets for other products. Having heard part of our future schedule, I'm sure you start to see why we hope Oklahomans will be interested in the trade fairs program.

YOUR GOVERNMENT WILL HELP YOU

Now let's see what you'd get if you decided to participate in a U.S. pavilion overseas:

First, you would get the advantage of professional display designers.

One of the people in my office says they are like a combination of Walt Disney, Thomas Alva Edison and P. T. Barnum. He is joking, of course, but it is true that they come close to being magicians in creating attractive shows in varied climates, and under varying conditions.

We provide American manufacturers with an animated "showcase" which generally is the hit of the fair. This means crowds—crowds of foreign businessmen and everyday people who will see your products in the best settings that can be devised for them.

Second, your products will be demonstrated by bilingual college students from the host country. Dressed in specially-designed costumes, the demonstrators are themselves sales features. They prove to their countrymen how easy it is to learn to operate American-made machines.

Third, our veteran exhibition managers take complete care of those pesky problems which may arise on the site—utilities, security, maintenance, and so forth.

Finally, we assign a world trade expert from the Department of Commerce to each U.S. Pavilion. Making use of descriptive literature and promotional materials provided by the exhibiting firms, this man answers questions and actively seeks buyers for American-made goods. All leads are turned over to the manufacturer and he is further advised and assisted on any necessary paper work.

These services comprise what you might call the OITF "package." But as the people who make Cracker Jack found out long ago, it's often advantageous to put a package within another package. And so it is with us.

THERE ARE MANY OTHER IMPORTANT AIDS AVAILABLE

The "trade fair package" is just a part of a larger package, which embraces all the varying services which the Commerce Department will put at your disposal if you're looking for foreign markets.

You can begin your approach by finding out whether the products you manufacture can be sold in foreign markets. Each commerce field office—the nearest one to Tulsa is in Dallas—has statistics on the export of almost every commodity to all foreign countries. The field office can provide you with a list of importers of products like yours.

Then our Commercial Intelligence Division in Washington can supply you with a fairly specific report indicating what competition can be expected from local products, and what countries currently supply competitive imports. These trade lists also contain the names of firms you may want to approach as potential distributors or agents for your goods.

You should keep in mind the fact that you also may face competition from U.S. producers operating subsidiaries or branch factories in the countries where you are seeking markets.

CHECK EVERY WEEK FOR ACTUAL SALES LEADS

Another quick way to find out whether your goods are wanted abroad is to consult the World Trade Leads section of Foreign Commerce Weekly, another Commerce Department publication. There you will find scores of inquiries from firms in other countries who are looking for products like yours.

Incidentally, one of your local newspapermen produced an excellent story 2 months ago by taking a list of these inquiries from Australia and personally inquiring of Tulsa area manufacturers whether they would be interested in starting negotiations.

This was on May 13, while an excellent World Trade Conference was under way at the University of Tulsa's College of Business Administration. I have a note here that a great deal of credit for the organization of the conference goes to Bill Sallans of Petroleo Interamericano, and I congratulate him.

YOUR TRADE CONFERENCE WAS GOOD

I hope that the chamber of commerce will find it possible to continue these conferences on a yearly basis, because I know that the contributions made by some of your local manufacturers to greater knowledge of ex-

port trade in your area should stimulate new business in many ways.

Getting back to our big Commerce Department "package", I should call your attention to a series of brochures called "World Trade Information Service." These give you everything you need to know about the economy of the foreign country you're interested in—as well as related reports on tariffs and regulations, customs duties, taxation policies, and money exchange.

CHECK ON YOUR FOREIGN AGENTS

When you receive an inquiry from a prospective foreign distributor or agent, it would be good thing to get a World Trade Directory report from the Department of Commerce. It will tell you about the foreign agent's nature of business, importance and general reputation, so that you will be guided in starting the negotiation of sales or agency agreements.

We have some fairly comprehensive handbooks on about 20 foreign countries which will give you almost all you need to know to become informed on each country as a market for your products.

THE NEW TRADE CENTERS ARE A SUCCESS

When we opened our first U.S. Trade Center in London on June 26, we had been able to provide most of the 61 exhibitors of housewares with agency connections, obtained in advance through our trade contact surveys.

Almost half of the housewares manufacturers showing in London had not done any selling in the United Kingdom before. Several months before the show opened, we sent their catalogs and other information ahead to the American Embassy in London. The Embassy's staff contacted appropriate agents and distributors, and a number of the exhibitors were ready to have their agents actually man the exhibits by the time the show opened. Most of the 61 exhibitors have reported excellent sales in the United Kingdom.

This new and novel overseas sales technique is to be repeated. At the request of the President, we are taking steps to add four more trade centers. One is under preparation in Bangkok; another in Lagos, Nigeria; and a third in Japan. A South American site will follow shortly.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE WILL GIVE YOU INDIVIDUAL ASSISTANCE

Returning once again to the Commerce Department package, let's consider a section we might call person to person or, more properly, businessman to businessman.

When you're planning to go overseas to look at potential markets or to confer with potential agents or distributors, let the Commerce Department know in advance. We will have the commercial officers in the appropriate Foreign Service posts alerted of your visit so they can be more helpful to you.

HOW TRADE MISSIONS CAN HELP YOU

We are planning to send out about a dozen trade missions to various countries of the world; the first will go to Nigeria on September 14, 1961.

These missions will include four or five businessmen, plus a director from the Commerce Department. They will travel from city to city in each of the mission countries meeting with business people, chambers of commerce, trade associations and government officials, discussing export-import questions and arranging joint ventures and licensing agreements.

If, for example, you are interested in doing business in Nigeria, write us a letter setting forth your proposal and we will arrange to have the trade mission take it along and discuss it with interested business people in that country.

There are many places in the world to which you can now export your goods which

were not opened as markets until recently. I suggest that you recheck the possibilities, and not assume that markets closed 2 years or even 1 year ago have remained closed.

A few months ago I saw a cartoon in one of the magazines. It showed a young scout from one of the new African countries talking to his chief. The scout said: "There's a fellow outside who just flew in on a DC-6B. Claims he's white god or something."

The joke was funny, but the butt was the fellow from the DC-6B. He'd come thinking he could operate under a sort of Stanley-and-Livingstone mystique, but he found that the tribesmen had gone modern, leaving him to fill the role of anachronism.

The point is the same, whether it's made by a cartoonist or by me: The world is moving ahead fast, building its markets and its allegiances as it goes. We've got to build with it, to adapt ourselves to its needs, to lead its aspirations.

You can be leaders in America's great world trade awakening. I hope you will.

Thank you very much for your kind attention. I'll be glad to answer any questions you may have. We want to help you sell abroad.

Fidel and the Catholics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on September 13, 1961:

FIDEL AND THE CATHOLICS

Fidel Castro's Kremlin-serving dictatorship has reacted with characteristic viciousness to the demonstration just staged against it in Havana by several thousand Roman Catholics—men, women, and children—taking part in a religious procession that has long been a traditional feature of Cuban life.

The procession—honoring Our Lady of Charity, regarded by Cuba's overwhelmingly Catholic population as the country's chief spiritual patroness—had been derided and declared illegal in advance by some of the Castro regime's noisiest and most noxious spokesmen. As a result, when the event took place, tension was high, and some of Fidel's militiamen started shooting at the participants, reportedly killing at least one, and wounding dozens of others.

Apparently this latest example of the tragic and evil nature of Castroism must be attributed to the fact that some of Fidel's mobsters—who have been indoctrinated with the virulent idea that any criticism of the Soviets is counterrevolutionary and therefore a thing to be smashed—felt justified in using guns and clubs to cope with the situation. After all, the processionists had persisted in shouting "Ouba si, Russia no," and "Long live Jesus Christ."

In the circumstances, it is not surprising that the Castroite bully boys (whose mental capacity probably leaves much to be desired) swung into action as they did. Dictator Fidel, however, although he purports to be a Catholic himself, has not apologized for their atrocious violence. On the contrary, his sleazy little Red tyranny has condemned the religious-minded marchers for having had the temerity to cry out against atheistic communism as a liberty-destroying thing

poisonous to the mind and spirit of men everywhere.

Indeed, turning the truth upside down in typical Red totalitarian fashion, the Havana dictatorship has issued a special communique accusing Cuba's Catholic nuns, priests, and bishops of plotting against "Doctor" Castro in an around-the-clock effort to overthrow and destroy him. To that end, according to the accusation, even the good sisters appear to have been conspiring—with the help of their primary-grade pupils—to hide guns in church and school basements in preparation for counterrevolutionary action against Fidel.

There seems to be a note of slightly desperate shrillness in all of this, as if the Castro despotism were beginning to feel real opposition from the rank and file in Cuba. In any event, the people of the country are predominantly Catholic, and that is a fact that may yet be Fidel's undoing as he ties himself tighter and tighter to the Kremlin and godless communism.

Freedom To Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Mr. John Lampl, of Valparaiso, Ind., who is active in farm program and farm management, recently wrote a review of former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson's book entitled "Freedom To Farm." Because of Mr. Lampl's experience with and knowledge of farming, I believe that he has the authority to write such a review.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Lampl's review printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM TO FARM

(Book by Ezra Taft Benson, reviewed by John E. Lampl)

Some of the first chapters of this book should be enjoyed by readers with a farming background as the author recalls boyhood experiences, both nostalgic and refreshing, of the good old days around his home in Idaho in the early 1900's. After reading his book the reader will have no doubt that Mr. Benson has a wealth of knowledge of farms and farming in this country. Otherwise, his book is a long and weary one man's opinion of what he thinks should be done about the so-called curse of overproduction and surplus confronting American agriculture.

The author is trying to convey to the general public his 8-year attempt to bind the modern farmer to the supply and demand agricultural economy that prevailed during the early 1900's and especially from 1920 to 1933. He fails to explain or reconcile the incompatible complexities between freedom to produce and the dilemma confronting the farmer at the market place. For example: at the present time, the farmer receives 8 cents a quart for whole milk while the consumer pays 24 cents a quart for the same product in a bottle at the retail grocer's. Freedom to farm; yes. Freedom to barter and market; no. He points out to the American consumer that the cost of food products is high; but he does not point out that

as that cost has soared during the past 7 years, prices paid to the producer have steadily declined. He does not justify effectively the reason for high consumer food prices coming in the wake of the technological revolution in American agriculture. The farmer with his ingenious skill and dedication to his ever increasing scientific profession must be penalized, ridiculed, and subjected to lower prices and lower standards of living while his food products are prohibitive from a cost basis to a great many Americans and starving millions the world over.

Mr. Benson goes to great length reviewing past congressional actions and devotes entirely too much time in defending his own farm policies. His slanted and politically partisan views of the farm dilemma should be read with an open mind. A more authentic and less biased economic and political history of American agriculture can be found elsewhere.

Plea for a Green Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation needs to undertake more realistic, creative and far-reaching programs for the best utilization, preservation and, if possible, replenishment of our out-of-door heritage—if it is to meet the needs of the future.

How can this more effectively be done? Recently, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall published an article in the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Plea for a Green Legacy."

In my judgment, the Secretary makes some astute observations and recommendations that deserve not only the thoughtful consideration of Congress but of the American people. As pointed out by the Secretary:

The challenge to conservation statesmanship in our time is the achievement of balance between the works of man and the handiwork of nature. However, the sad truth is that development tends to outrun planning in our society. If we are to maintain man's proper relationship to the land, it is plain that we must broaden the role of resource planning in the management of our national estate.

Reflecting further upon the way in which conservation is a responsibility not only of Congress but of the people, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 11, 1961]

PLEA FOR A GREEN LEGACY

(By Stewart L. Udall, U.S. Secretary of the Interior)

WASHINGTON.—With all the weight of his world leadership responsibilities upon him, the contemporary American is rushing at a headlong pace to expand his scientific technology and to develop his land and its resources.

Our capacity to alter the world of nature is truly awesome. Population pressures and the requirements of commercial expansion and urban growth are constantly at work enlarging the manmade portion of our environment and diminishing the natural.

Indeed, the challenge to conservation statesmanship in our time is the achievement of balance between the works of men and the handiwork of nature.

Admittedly, we must move ahead with the development of our land resources. Likewise, our technology must be refined. But in the long run life will succeed only in a life-giving environment, and we can no longer afford unnecessary sacrifices of living space and natural landscapes to "progress."

The sad truth is that development tends to outrun planning in our society. More often than not, the bulldozer's work is done before the preservationist and the planner arrive on the scene.

BROADER PLANNING URGED

If we are to maintain man's proper relationship to the land, it is plain that we must insist that our developers be more conservation minded, and we must broaden the role of resource planning in the management of our national estate.

The American continent has, from the very first, been hospitable to humankind. Its glory has always been its spaciousness and solitude. But the good earth will remain good only if we make it so. In our haste to build new factories and roads and suburbs we must take care that man's need to refresh himself in his natural environment is not foreclosed.

President Kennedy has called for one last great effort in the 1960's to finish the conservation work begun by Theodore Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt counseled Americans to "set apart forever for the use and benefit of our people as a whole rich, forested lands and the flower-clad meadows of our mountains."

"To skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them," Mr. Roosevelt warned.

CAPE COD TO INDIANA DUNES

This same spirit motivated the first major conservation accomplishment of President Kennedy's administration—the creation of a magnificent National Seashore Park on the ocean sands of Cape Cod.

A few days ago I climbed to the highest of the Indiana dunes along Lake Michigan to view a race between industrial development and conservation. In 1916 Stephen Mather, the first Director of the National Park Service, hiked to the same promontory and urged that a great national park embracing 26 miles of dune shoreland be created for the populous Midwest heartland—the only area of the United States which has no major unit in the National Park System.

But Mather gathered too little support, and now one of his friends pointed to the remaining isolated tracts of this unique shoreland and said to me:

"You are 40 years too late."

At every hand near our growing centers of population similar opportunities are slipping through our fingers. Once land development has begun it is invariably too late, for land prices quickly soar beyond the public purse.

AGGRESSIVE PROGRAM SOUGHT

What strategy, what plan of action, will save enough space for all of our people? Leadership from our public men is, of course, indispensable. Federal action is needed to round out our national park and wildlife refuge systems and to develop fully the recreation potential of our forestlands.

We must also have aggressive State park expansion programs—such as those in New

York, California, and Pennsylvania—to reserve new parklands before they are preempted. Municipal leadership, too, is essential if we are to provide adequate city park systems and enough fringe open space to permit our cities to expand gracefully.

We also need—and here the burden falls heaviest on local leadership—creative and farsighted use of zoning regulations and land-use plans to compel the speculator and developer to put people first and insure that adequate space is allotted to playgrounds and parks.

Government can provide the main thrust, but individuals must play a creative role if we are insure an adequate heritage for all Americans.

PHILANTHROPISTS NEEDED

Above all, the cause of conservation needs a new generation of outdoor philanthropists. Philanthropy comes to our vocabulary from the Greek, and describes an attitude of loving mankind.

On looking back over the history of conservation it is surprising how much of our total accomplishment is attributable to quiet men from private life who at crucial moments have provided the needed inspiration and wherewithal.

The towering redwood tree of the conservation forest has been, of course, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. His natural and historic philanthropies span our continent. Every American who loves the out of doors owes this man a debt.

His saving work has benefited such far-flung and poetic places as Acadia National Park in Maine, Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado, Hudson Palisades in New Jersey, and Williamsburg, colonial capital in Virginia. Mr. Rockefeller also used his generosity to evoke generosity in others.

When decisions hung in the balance, he inspired the States of North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia to put up the matching gifts that led to the establishment of Great Smoky Mountains and Shenandoah National Parks. Now his son, Laurance, is carrying on his tradition, and it was he who gave to the people of the United States our newest national park in the Virgin Islands.

POETRY OF THE LAND

"The United States themselves are essentially the greatest poems," Walt Whitman once wrote. And those conservation philanthropists who have caught Whitman's vision have acted so that the poetry of our land might be sung by nature for all men of all ages.

Today foundations and individuals are sponsoring a variety of conservation projects. The Avalon and Old Dominion Foundations of the Mellon family have financed studies of our vanishing shorelines—and have underwritten much of the initial cost of our first national seashore at Cape Hatteras.

In Virginia the Old Dominion Foundation, under the inspired leadership of Paul Mellon, is surveying and purchasing secluded wilderness spots of riverbank, marsh, and forest. These are being saved both as scientific laboratories of life in its natural balance, as well as, in the words of Old Dominion's Monroe Bush, "for the people who will live 25 years from now."

Philanthropy has many pathways. How many Americans know of Mrs. Louis Brughere's gift of the Vanderbilt Mansion; the National Geographic Society's gift of Russell Cave to the national park system; the largess of former Maine Governor, Percival P. Baxter, who acquired Mount Katahdin and nearly 200,000 surrounding acres of magnificent mountain wilderness and endowed his native State with one of the largest and finest State parks in the Union?

MANY WAYS TO HELP

Who recalls the Princeton professor and his wife who donated the lovely Herontown Woods as a nature sanctuary, or the man in Lincoln, Mass., who volunteered to have his woods and fields zoned to remain always in their native state?

All these people acted from a shared conviction that the private citizen must play a vital role in preserving an environment that renews and sustains human life.

Every city, every State, every region should have its foundation, its citizens' band with the motives and zeal of the Save-the-Redwoods-League (California) or the Sudbury Valley Trustees (Massachusetts) working to preserve threatened native grounds. Enlightened pioneers in land conservation have already fashioned the tools. The opportunities for their use are present at every hand.

Let us never have to say, in sorrow, as did Plato: "There are mountains in Attica which can now keep nothing but bees, but which were clothed, not so very long ago, with trees."

The individual who wishes to contribute to conservation has numerous options. He may donate land or money to State or Federal park agencies such as the national park trust fund. He can give his land, his money, or his time to a private organization such as the Nature Conservancy.

ORGANIZATION'S WORK DESCRIBED

Mettler's Woods, in New Jersey; the entire watershed of Elder Creek in northern California; Mainus Gorge in Westchester County; Battle Creek Cyprus Swamp near the Delaware Water Gap, and Holly Ridge in Missouri are only a few of the unique natural areas preserved through gifts made to the Nature Conservancy.

On the other hand those who wish to use their land for life, can, by will or testament, add to the public estate and to the enjoyment of all. Close to Metropolitan Washington, in the fields of rural Maryland, rises Sugarloaf Mountain, a landmark for miles around. The entire mountain was once owned by the Strong family, who left this lovely estate and its gardens, as well as the forested mountain, for perpetual public use.

The individual who wishes to make a lesser, but no less significant, gift can voluntarily zone his property and dedicate a scenic easement that will maintain in perpetuity the present character of his lands. In Monterey County, Calif., over 4,000 acres have been pledged to such scenic easements—including some of the incomparable coastline of the Big Sur.

Conservation may also serve a dual purpose. In seeking to honor their heroes men often have turned to monuments of stone or bronze.

EXAMPLE OF A MEMORIAL

Shortly after the passing of Theodore Roosevelt, his friends saved a lovely Potomac River island which was marked for conversion into a utility storage depot and gave it to the country as a nature memorial to a man who had a lifetime love affair with the out of doors.

Many of us in Washington regard this "wild little island" in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial as perhaps the most fitting of our monuments—and the one that would accord the greatest pleasure to the man it honors.

The conservation philanthropy needed today must come from all of us who during our lives have made withdrawals from nature's bank and want to restore the balance with a corresponding conservation deposit. This work of restoration and renewal is worthy of our highest efforts, and even those who lack wherewithal can become the organizers and supporters of groups that will

give new dimensions to our conservation effort.

Few of us can hope to leave a work of art, or a poem, to posterity; but together—if we act before it is too late—we can set aside a few more great parks, and round out our system of refuges for wildlife. Or, working at other levels, we can reserve a marsh or meadow, or an avenue of open space as a green legacy for other generations.

By a series of such acts of conservation we can do much to save what Thomas Jefferson called the face and character of our country.

If we do this, surely those who follow, whether or not our names survive, will remember and praise our vision and our works.

The "Communist Manifesto" and Russian Totalitarianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that my colleagues of the Congress may have an opportunity to read them, excerpts from a speech made by Dr. James D. Bales, Harding College, Searcy, Ark., to the Harding Academy on September 12, 1961:

THE "COMMUNIST MANIFESTO" AND RUSSIAN TOTALITARIANISM

Norman Thomas and the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation accept the "Communist Manifesto" as a Socialist document, but they maintain that it is not related to Russian totalitarianism. In a "Socialist Reading List" currently circulated by the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation, we find the following: "Marx's 'Communist Manifesto' has been misinterpreted by Communists and capitalists alike as the prophecy of the totalitarian system in Russia. It should be read carefully by any modern reader concerned with the Socialist movement, for it is probably the single most classic document of the Socialist movement."

These Socialists are denying that the Communists in Russia are basically following the key concepts in the "Communist Manifesto." Russian totalitarianism, they are saying, is not the outcome of an effort to follow the "Communist Manifesto." The implication is that if the "Communist Manifesto" were applied, socialism, not Russian totalitarianism, would result.

As a matter of fact, what is taking place in Russia is not a violation of the letter or the spirit of the "Communist Manifesto." What is seen in Russia is not simply Russian totalitarianism but Communist totalitarianism which will inevitably flow from any serious attempt to implement the "Communist Manifesto."

Let us consider some of the doctrines in the "Communist Manifesto" which show that it should be easy to see that communistic totalitarianism must issue from any serious attempt to follow the "Communist Manifesto."

Communism has always been an international movement. "Workingmen of all countries, unite" are the closing words of the manifesto. It presents the concept of proletarian internationalism, which concept is adhered to by the Communists today. The

proletariat, according to the manifesto, should place its so-called interests above the interests of the nation, and join hands in an international movement to overthrow capitalism. The Communists are trying to do this very thing today.

The manifesto presents the idea of the Communist Party as the elite group who guide the proletariat to victory. They "bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality . . . they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole." (Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party," Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1957, p. 71.) This same concept is stressed by Communists today.

The manifesto maintains that irreconcilable antagonism exists between the proletariat and the capitalists and that this class struggle is present everywhere (ibid., pp. 46-48). The Communists today maintain that war to the death must take place between capitalists and the proletariat.

The manifesto teaches that the proletariat will destroy the capitalists. "But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians." (ibid., p. 58.) So teach the Communists today.

Violent revolution is also taught in the manifesto. "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite." (ibid., p. 112.) Communists teach that violent revolution is essential to the establishment of communism, under most conditions, and they practiced violent revolution when they came to power in Russia, in China, etc.

The manifesto teaches not only the violent overthrow of the capitalist state, but of all social conditions. In other words, they maintain that all our social conditions and institutions are the outcome of our capitalist society and with the overthrow of the capitalist society there must also ultimately be the overthrow of all present social conditions and institutions. The revolutionary remaking of man is a doctrine of the manifesto and it is also a doctrine of the Communists today.

The manifesto teaches the doctrine of economic determinism, although Communists sometimes deny that they teach it. "Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property . . . social forms spring from your present mode of production and form of property—historical relations that rise and disappear in the progress of production" (ibid., pp. 78-79). "Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life?" (ibid., p. 83). This doctrine is accepted by the Communists in Russia and they are endeavoring, among other ways, to make a new Soviet man through changing the economic system. It is of interest that their idea of communism has led them to try to remake the economic system, instead of their idea being the result of a change of the economic system. This is one of the contradictions within communism.

The manifesto maintains that the family as we know it must be abolished (ibid., pp. 79-82). The efforts of some of the Communists, when they took over Russia, to abolish the family, and the efforts of the Chinese Communists to undermine the family in China, are not something which is foreign to the letter and spirit of the manifesto.

The manifesto in its concept of class, and class struggle, implies the doctrine of dialectical materialism. It is also bound up in the concept of economic determinism as set forth in the manifesto. Dialectical materialism is taught by the Communists today.

The manifesto teaches that the capitalist's concept of morality, law and religion are but a means of protecting his class interests. "Law, morality, religion are to him (the proletariat, J.D.B.) so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests" (ibid., p. 67, see also pp. 78-79). The class concept of morality is held by Communists today. In line with the manifesto they view morality as but a means of promoting class interest, and as their class is diametrically opposed to ours their moral system is not only different but in actual opposition to our moral system.

The manifesto teaches the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat. "We have seen above, that the first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy" (ibid., p. 85). Communism today teaches the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The dictatorship of the proletariat seizes all power—economic, social and political—by despotic means. "The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class. Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production" (ibid., pp. 85-86). This includes the seizure of all land, abolition of the right of inheritance, confiscation of the property of those who do not go along with them, state monopoly in banking, communication, transportation and labor. "Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture." (ibid., pp. 86-87). Russian Communists have been doing all of this or intended to do all of it.

The withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat after a classless society has been established, is taught both in the manifesto (ibid., pp. 87-88) and in Russia today.

The "Communist Manifesto" teaches that all revolutionary movements should be supported in their effort to overthrow the existing order. "In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things" (ibid., p. 111). This is done in order to help bring about the communistic revolution and takeover of society (ibid., pp. 109-112). The famous January 6, 1961 speech of Khrushchev emphasized this idea when he said that the Communists support the so-called national-liberation wars, such as the one in which Castro rose to power in Cuba.

In view of the identity between such doctrine as these in the manifesto and in current communism, we cannot accept the assertion of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation that the "Communist Manifesto" is not a prophecy of Russian totalitarianism. Any serious effort to follow the manifesto must result in a brutalitarian dictatorship.

Unemployment Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Post on September 14, 1961:

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

In the September issue of Reader's Digest, Mr. James Daniel tenders an interesting explanation for high unemployment. The unemployment rate which recently stood at 6.9 percent, he says has been manipulated upward by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to push Uncle Sam into new spending programs and new controls. These propositions are supported with a wealth of detail about new definitions of unemployment and new sampling techniques, all designed to produce more statistical unemployment, and about discrepancies among different sample survey results and census counts.

If the author had carried his research a little further, he would have discovered that it is not the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but the Bureau of the Census, which until very recently was in charge of these statistics and still continues to produce them. He would also have discovered that there are ways of analyzing the sources of error when discrepancies appear, such as recourse to the separate body of data on unemployment covered by compensation. And if he had consulted his political judgment, he might have wondered why the Eisenhower administration should have been so eager to juggle the statistics and increase the pressure for public spending. There is no reason for inventing a devil theory of unemployment.

It is true that American methods of counting unemployment yield very much higher results than British and continental methods. We obtain our data through a monthly sample survey of 35,000 households, and count everyone who is looking for a job. The British count only those who are registered with official employment exchanges. If they used the American system, their unemployment rate would double. Consequently it would be a great mistake to make direct comparisons between the American and foreign unemployment rates. But there is every reason to think that the American is the better method.

What kind of statistics the Government collects must depend on the use it wants to make of them. Under the Employment Act of 1946, the principal function of the unemployment statistics is to give an idea how close the economy is to full capacity operation. For this purpose, the statistics should be as comprehensive as possible, and should include all who are seeking to work, regardless of how badly they need or do not need a job. From this point of view, perhaps one ought to include in total unemployment the time lost through involuntary part-time employment. This has been proposed by Senator DOUGLAS, but there are statistical difficulties. Some of these data are now stated separately.

If the data are to be used as a guide to social conditions, then a single total such as 4.5 million unemployed, and a single ratio such as 6.9 percent, will not do the job.

Such figures overstate the extent of distress. Unemployment of a teenager during vacation time, of a social security pensioner, of a housewife with an employed husband, does not mean the same thing as unemployment of a family main breadwinner. Unemployment for less than 5 weeks, which accounts for about two-fifths of the present total, does not compare with long-term unemployment, nor unemployment covered by compensation with uncovered joblessness. The Bureau of Labor Statistics supplies detailed breakdowns on these and other facts. Perhaps they should be stressed more, and the large aggregates deemphasized. But in no case is there justification for trying to make things look better by tampering with the statistics, instead of dealing with the problem of unemployment itself.

Tribute to Representative Robert W. Hemphill, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a splendid editorial appearing in the Gaffney Ledger, of Gaffney, S.C., on Tuesday, September 12, 1961, entitled "Congressman HEMPHILL."

This editorial is a tribute to the distinguished Congressman, ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Representative of the Fifth District of South Carolina, for his active, able, and loyal service to the people of his own district and the rest of South Carolina in Washington.

It is my personal pleasure to bring this editorial to the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

To the tribute paid by this editorial I would like to add my praise of BOB HEMPHILL's outstanding representation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN HEMPHILL

Congressman ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Representative of the Fifth South Carolina District, has informed friends in Washington he plans to seek reelection for fourth term next summer. That is good news.

Mr. HEMPHILL, who lives at Chester, has made the Fifth District, and the Nation a first-class Congressman. He is active and energetic in looking after the interests of his area and section but he is not provincial in his attitudes. He studies problems from a national viewpoint when that seems to be required, as in the case of textile imports. He is a genuine Democrat who bases his actions on a reasonable balance between liberalism and conservatism. This enables him to make South Carolina's Fifth District a topnotch Representative in Washington.

Some of Mr. HEMPHILL's friends sought to persuade him to run for Governor of South Carolina. That is a flattering suggestion, naturally, but Mr. HEMPHILL has come to the conclusion he can best serve his constituents in Washington. The Ledger concurs in that decision, and wishes Mr. HEMPHILL continued success in his present position.

Judge E. C. O'Rear, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on Tuesday, September 12, Judge E. C. O'Rear died at his home in Woodford County, Ky.

Judge O'Rear was Kentucky's most distinguished citizen, and no one lives in our State who can take his place. Born in 1863, his life and that of his pioneer father, Daniel O'Rear, who was born in 1796 at Boonesboro, Ky.—a settlement established by Daniel Boone—spanned the terms of every President of the United States, beginning with George Washington.

Judge O'Rear was an outstanding lawyer and served as chief justice of the court of appeals, Kentucky's highest court, from 1908 to 1911. He was a political leader in its highest sense, and in 1911 he was the Republican nominee for Governor. I shall always remember, as one of the memorable experiences of my life, meeting Judge O'Rear in the law office of my father in my hometown of Somerset, and hearing him speak, when he came there as a candidate for Governor.

He was a profound scholar and by force of his brilliant mind, his eloquence, and his character, he influenced thought and action in Kentucky during his entire life.

I know that I express the feeling of the people of Kentucky when I say that he was a noble man, and that he represented the best qualities of our State and Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that two recent articles about Judge O'Rear be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE E. C. O'REAR DIES; WAS "MR. KENTUCKY COLONEL"

VERSAILLES, Ky.—Former Court of Appeals Judge Edward C. O'Rear, whose snow-white hair and goatee earned him the title of "Mr. Kentucky Colonel," died at 2 a.m. today at his home, Ashley House, on the Midway Road. He was 98.

A native of Montgomery County, Judge O'Rear was a former county judge and chief justice of the appellate court, serving on the State's highest tribunal from 1908-11.

O'Rear, oldest practicing attorney in the State, was for years chief counsel in Kentucky for the Consolidation Coal Co. He resigned the position last year.

WAS GOP NOMINEE

He was the unsuccessful Republican nominee for Governor in 1911 when he was defeated by the late James B. McCreary.

Still regarded as a topflight lawyer, Mr. O'Rear had slowed a little in recent years. He was a Woodford County gentleman farmer and looked the part with the neatly trimmed goatee of a typical Kentucky colonel.

Less than a year ago, he spoke at the dedication of Montgomery County's new courthouse at Mount Sterling.

His appearance recalled the legendary story about Camargo University, which the judge dreamed up on the spur of the moment more than a half-century ago.

As related by him, he was attending a banquet in an Eastern city with other distinguished judges when each was called upon to arise and state his name and college.

Mr. O'Rear had never attended college, but he had received his early education in a little country school in the village of Camargo, about 5 miles east of Mount Sterling.

READ LAW

After that he "read law" in the office of a Mount Sterling attorney to gain his legal knowledge.

When it came time to introduce himself, O'Rear arose solemnly and said, "I am Edward C. O'Rear, University of Camargo." Then he resumed his seat.

Mr. O'Rear was the 14th child in a family of 15. He was born in Camargo in 1863. His father, Daniel O'Rear, was born at Boonesboro in 1796 while George Washington was still serving as President.

Thus, the elder O'Rear's lifetime and that of his son spanned the terms of every President of the United States.

The jurist described himself as "self-educated to a great degree."

He was a member of the St. John Episcopal Church here.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Mabel Taylor O'Rear; 3 sons, retired Col. John T. H. O'Rear, San Francisco; James B. O'Rear and Prentice O'Rear, both of Frankfort; 2 daughters, Mrs. William Scruggs, Frankfort, and Mrs. William E. Bradley, Woodford County; 7 grandchildren; and 16 great-grandchildren.

The body is to be taken to the residence from the Miller-Blackburn Funeral Home.

Services have tentatively been set for Thursday. Burial will be in Mount Sterling.

JUDGE O'REAR DIES AT 98—A SCHOLAR, WIT, AND GENTLEMAN

(By Allan M. Trout)

FRANKFORT, Ky., September 12.—Ed C. O'Rear, lawyer, jurist, and scholar, died early Tuesday at his farm home in Woodford County at the age of 98 years 7 months and 10 days.

Despite his advanced years, O'Rear had been active until he sprained an ankle in February. He had been bedfast since June.

One year ago he journeyed to Mount Sterling to dedicate a new courthouse replacing the one only 3 years old when he was elected Montgomery County judge in 1893.

Two years ago, at 96, he brilliantly delivered the annual lecture at Boone Day ceremonies of the Kentucky Historical Society in the old statehouse at Frankfort.

PRaised BY COMBS

His great mind had remained normally active until sapped by his last illness. Of magnificent physique, he needed only the aid of a cane for walking until he sprained his ankle.

Governor Combs, at Lynchburg, Va., issued this simple tribute when advised of the death:

"The entire Commonwealth will miss Judge O'Rear. Besides being a distinguished member of the bar, and noted for his sharp mind and keen wit, he was an outstanding example of the Kentucky gentleman."

AN EMINENT CITIZEN

Chief Justice Robert B. Bird of the court of appeals had this to say of O'Rear's death:

"The court of appeals deeply regrets the passing of one of its most illustrious former members. The courts of Kentucky have lost a valued friend and the Commonwealth has lost an eminent citizen."

The career of Edward Clay O'Rear was a record of distinguished attainment. It was the old, yet ever-fresh, record of the self-taught boy who rises from poverty to riches.

In public service, he was judge of the court of appeals from 1900 to 1911. He was the Republican nominee for Governor in 1911, but lost to James B. McCreary.

RAN FOR CONGRESS

He was county judge of Montgomery, his native county, in 1894-98, the only Republican ever to hold that office. He once ran for Congress in the old 10th District, but was defeated. In World War II, he was State chairman of the salvage drive.

O'Rear was an effective spearhead of opposition, through the years, to change in 1890-91 the constitution of Kentucky, either by convention or amendment.

He had been a brilliant practitioner of the law since 1886, with offices in the same third-floor suite of the McClure Building here since 1912.

OWNED 1,800 ACRES

O'Rear was one of the key figures in opening legal ways to develop the vast coal and timber resources of east Kentucky. Since 1912, he had been chief counsel in Kentucky for Consolidation Coal Corp., the biggest coal mining operation in the world.

O'Rear shrewdly invested in land part of the fortune he earned as a lawyer. He owned perhaps 1,800 acres of choice bluegrass farmland in the counties of Franklin, Woodford, and Fayette.

Since 1943, he had lived in baronial splendor at Ashley House, the seat of his Woodford County farm on the pike between Versailles and Midway. Before then, he had lived in gracious affluence at Glen Ary, the historic county seat near Jett Station, just east of Frankfort.

SUPERS RACONTEUR

But it was in the long life of his stout body and great mind that O'Rear touched the stars.

In him was the rare combination of the judge's lawyer and the jury's pet.

In oratory, he was master of the mellow metaphor, and disarming gentleness. And when he whirled for the kill, his rapier thrust of satire, while always felt, seldom drew blood.

His was a hearty Kentucky appetite for the best of viands and drinks. He was a fine host, a superb raconteur. He had an astounding knowledge of the arts, the classics of world literature, the Scriptures and, of course, the law.

STRAIGHT AS A RAMROD

Even as a nonagenarian, O'Rear's person vibrated with the vigor of robust good health. A trim goatee, bushy eyebrows, and iron-gray hair accentuated the ruddy, unwrinkled glow of his face. He was straight as a ramrod, steel-eyed as an eagle. He always groomed himself meticulously in carefully tailored attire.

He had no particular rule for longevity, although the rare ability to relax did not hurt him. The truth is, O'Rear was made of tough stuff, as was his father before him. Daniel O'Rear begat him at age 67, and was to sire two more before his death.

His father was born in 1796 inside the stockade at old Fort Boonesboro, near Richmond. That was the last year of George Washington's second term as President. Thus the father and son, together, spanned every President of the United States, a record now probably without parallel elsewhere in the Nation.

O'Rear was born February 2, 1863, at Camargo, the 13th of 15 children. His mother was widowed shortly after the birth of the last. With so big a brood, she was compelled to put the boys to work. Schooling was out of the question.

O'Rear's first job was as news butcher on the train between Mount Sterling and Louisville. Then he mastered the trade of printer at the Sentinel and the Democrat, both at Mount Sterling; the Outlook, at Owingsville, and the Sentinel, at Flemingsburg.

RODE FOR 2 DAYS

It was as a printer, therefore, that O'Rear went to West Liberty, at age 17, to run the Mountain Scorchers. Capt. John T. Williams, a Confederate cavalryman of Morgan County, had brought a herd of horses to the Mount Sterling market. He sold all but one nag and his own saddle horse.

It was that nag O'Rear rode back to West Liberty, in company with the redoubtable and loquacious old rebel. It took them two long and hard days to ride the 56 miles.

Publisher of the Scorchers was John Tom Hazelrigg, one of the ablest mountain lawyers of his day. Hazelrigg, the scion of a British general and Member of Parliament, allowed the young editor-printer to read law in his office.

O'Rear not only mastered there enough law to be admitted to the bar, but wooed and won the daughter of his mentor, Virginia Lee Hazelrigg. That marriage ended in divorce in the early 1930's, after which O'Rear married the former Mabel Taylor, Frankfort.

O'Rear went back to Mount Sterling and hung his shingle in 1886. He was defeated for Congress in 1888, supervised the U.S. census in the 10th district in 1890.

SOUTHEAST LAND BOOM

His big chance came with the land boom in southeast Kentucky in the 1890's. E. H. Patterson, Pineville, employed him to abstract titles to hundreds of thousands of mineral-rich acres in the upper valley of the Cumberland, and the headwaters country of the Kentucky River.

This assignment took O'Rear abroad three times. But of more importance, it won for him the acquaintance, then the confidence, of eastern capitalists ready to spend millions to tap the billions of wealth in the Kentucky mountains.

It was an up-and-coming barrister in his early prime, then, who was elected to the court of appeals in 1900. There, for 11 years, his extraordinary mind surged far out and beyond the limits observed by ordinary jurists.

FOUR OPINIONS RECALLED

Of all his gemlike opinions, four stand out as having touched the lives of millions of Kentuckians in four decades. And their importance is embellished by his scholarship.

His historic opinion of 1909 that legalized parimutuel betting, for example, traced the relationship between man and horse to the dawn of recorded history.

Another of the classic four upheld the Cammack Act of 1906, making the county the voting unit in local-option elections. This was the legal device by which prohibitionists dried Kentucky before national prohibition of World War I, and were well on their way to dry it again before a 1948 act made the county seat one unit, the rest of the county another.

WROTE DAY OPINION

In this opinion, O'Rear traced the county as a unit of government to pre-Magna Carta days in England.

It was O'Rear who wrote the opinion upholding the Day law of 1904—the law that compelled segregation of the races in Kentucky schools until the Supreme Court nullified it in 1954.

In this opinion, O'Rear summarized a vast store of anthropological findings on both the cross-breeding and in-breeding of races.

But his greatest stroke as a jurist was to write the learned opinion clearing legal uncertainty from land titles in east Kentucky. This doubt had beclouded them

since enactment of the Virginia land grant law before Kentucky statehood in 1792.

OPENED STATE'S EAST

For decades, the general assembly had been trying to nullify the compact by which these old Virginia land titles had been carried forward into Kentucky law. At last the 1906 session wrote a law that the court of appeals, and later the supreme court could uphold.

This monumental dissertation by O'Rear, found at 127 Ky. 667, traces title law in the Appalachian region from the chaos of the early 1900's, to the simplicity of crown grants in the late 1600's.

His opinion literally opened East Kentucky to safe investment in secure land titles. Without that assurance, outside capital had been reluctant to pry open the mountain treasure house.

RESIGNED FROM COURT

O'Rear had been reelected to the high court in 1908 for another term of 8 years. But he resigned in 1911, after his defeat for Governor, and began the private practice in Frankfort ended by his death.

As a lawyer, however, O'Rear did not cater altogether to the big stuff. He'd take just about anything that walked through his door. While he commanded lush fees at the top, he'd do this run-of-the-mine practice for the fees his humble clients could afford.

He never got too old or too big to raise his experienced voice in neighborhood affairs.

HONORED BY SCHOOLS

Despite his lack of formal education, honorary doctorates of law were conferred upon him by University of Kentucky and Kentucky Wesleyan. In 1959, Gov. A. B. Chandler conferred upon him the Governor's Medallion for distinguished public service.

O'Rear is survived by his second wife; 5 children from his first marriage, Col. John T. H. O'Rear, San Francisco, James B. O'Rear, Prentice O'Rear, and Mrs. William Scruggs, all of Frankfort, and Mrs. William E. Bradley, of Woodford County; 7 grandchildren, and 16 great-grandchildren.

Imports and Our Economy—The Relationship Between Aid and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, from the 21st District, at the Mining Congress Conference, held at Seattle, Wash., on September 11, 1961, on the subject of imports and our economy:

IMPORTS AND OUR ECONOMY—THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AID AND TRADE

(By the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania)

Patience sometimes is said to be the legislator's greatest virtue. With patience and conviction we can sometimes accomplish a great deal by way of amendment.

Three months after I became a Member of Congress, I became convinced that major changes must be made in our thinking and

planning in both foreign aid and reciprocal trades.

This past month a small, but significant change, was made in foreign aid legislation by way of the amendment I've sponsored since my first awakening to the inseparable relationship between "aid and trade."

This amendment, although not in the absolute form I presented, still lays down the principle that Americans should not be taxed to put themselves out of business, out of jobs, and into industrial oblivion.

Simply put, the Dent amendment means that no American taxpayer's money can be spent to build production facilities, factories, mines or agricultural developments abroad if the country receiving the aid exports the products of these facilities back to the United States.

It was a bitter pill to swallow for the out-and-out internationalists, both in as well as out of government.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee under the able and conscientious leadership of my friend and neighbor from Fayette County, the Honorable TOM MORGAN, helped me save the amendment by having a senior member of the committee, the Honorable CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, amend the original, allowing the foreign country to ship back 10 percent of the production before becoming disqualified for foreign aid. This saved at least 90 percent of the practical portion, and 100 percent of the principle involved.

The real fight was put on in the conference committee, when the State Department pulled out all stops to kill the Dent-Zablocki compromise. It was the bitterest fight of all the issues at stake in the House/Senate conference. In order to save the principle of the amendment, the House conferees had to accept an additional 10 percent by allowing the aid-receiving countries to ship 20 percent of their products back to the United States.

Without both MORGAN and ZABLOCKI being members of the conference, the amendment would have been killed by State Department officials, especially the Foreign Trade Department under Under Secretary George Ball. No one deserves more credit than the chairman, "Tom" MORGAN, for standing pat on the principle involved.

Conviction has taken us this far; patience will get us all the way. The day must come when we realize that unless we protect our home economy, we can't help the underdeveloped nations or anyone else, including ourselves.

The one point that seems to have been missed by many of our colleagues is the fact that the relationship between free aid and free trade is finally admitted by Congress and our Government.

The Washington Post was very critical of my amendment. It protested our attempt to save jobs for Americans by limiting the aid-receiving countries in their exportations to the United States of competitive products at prices below the cost of manufacture in America.

We weren't stopping aid to needy peoples, we were trying to stop exploration of underprivileged peoples who are forced to work for as low as 5 cents an hour, under the most heartbreaking inhuman working conditions, in order that a few families and officials can get richer by shipping their low-cost items into the American market at fabulous profits because of the great volumes consumed by the American public.

As an example, a few years ago, Japan shipped a few thousand cigarette lighters to the United States. In 1958, Japanese low-wage employers shipped 42,600,000 lighters to the United States. This represents over \$50 million in the American marketplace, and yet, the free traders in our midst say this is made up by selling Japan \$50 million worth of cotton. What we really traded was

American jobs. For every job we gained picking cotton, we lost at least 20 making lighters.

This is true in almost every phase of our economy. We sell Germany certain types of steel plate. We buy back Volkswagens. No one seems to figure how many less jobs it takes to make a half ton of steel as against an automobile ready for the road with glass, tires, seats, battery, engine, springs, ignition, lights, and the many components that make up a modern car.

By starting to close the foreign aid loophole (the Dent amendment), in our trade agreements, we at least will protect the American worker and investor against the exploiters both here and abroad from using his tax money to put him out of work.

Helping a needy neighbor is charity. It stops being charity when you buy back from your neighbor the help you gave him in the first place—it then becomes stupidity.

If it were plain stupidity we could worry a little less because sooner or later we would outgrow it. It's more than that. It's mixed up with enormous profits, exploitation of workers, international moneychanging, so-called global diplomacy and plain one-world favoritism by men of such stature, their wishes are almost law.

These are the dangers. Little peoples have protection only through elected representatives and with the combinations of power, press, politics, professors, and public figures, the congressional prestige in this field is almost nonexistent. The registered lobbyists, the representatives of foreign countries, importers, and exporters in and out of Government is the greatest group of talent ever assembled in our Capitol.

As chairman of the committee studying the effect of imports and exports upon American unemployment, I can assure you all that this Nation is in deep, serious trouble unless we put more hard, commonsense and less theoretical planning into our trade and aid "deals." Let's call them deals, because stripped of their high-sounding names, that's all they are.

My committee has heard from many areas of employment. No responsible witness has said jobs are created by our policy, except in the field of foreign aid. Any 8-year-old kid knows that if you give away \$4 billion, and you buy 80 percent of the goods from yourself to give away, you'll have to have some people to make the goods to give away. This isn't funny, we actually count the goods we give away or sell for foreign counterpart (funny) money as exports in our trade balance.

We're told that we must trade to make our country prosperous. This is only true, however, when we buy what we need and sell what we don't need.

We do it differently. We sell cotton and buy shirts; we sell logs and buy plywood; we sell hides and buy leather; and now we even go so far as to sell or give away wheat and buy macaroni and bread.

We're becoming a supplier of raw materials and a buyer of consumer products. The real victim is the American worker, looking for a job that's been exported.

Did you know that right now we are buying bread to the extent that hearings have been requested by both the bakery companies and their workers?

We have testimony from macaroni manufacturers showing that the short supply of Durum wheat necessary for the making of good macaroni products has been sold to competitive nations, while the American plants either shut down or make an inferior product. In either case, it helps foreign traders.

This is also true of hides. Our tanneries are either shut down or working part time because foreign buyers are grabbing raw hides at high prices and using their own

cheap labor for processing, ship back leather and leather goods below American costs of production.

This way, the American taxpayer gets it both ways, coming and going. He loses his job because we export the raw material, and then he is forced to buy cheap foreign-made goods to stretch his reduced income which in turn takes his neighbor's job.

You can't win in a game with marked cards and dealt by professional gamblers. Foreign traders are professionals. There's one consolation, the shirt we're losing is imported, either Japanese or "Hongkonganese."

These are just the minor disturbances in the field of trade and aid, as we practice these so-called diplomatic acts.

We've covered a few products, now let's take a look at the ore picture. Slowly, but surely, our mineral-producing areas are being forced into the same governmental controls as their wheat-producing neighbors. With the coming subsidies for lead and zinc, we are stepping up the control of our Government over prices, wages, and profits. This may be good, it may be desirable, it may even be the ultimate goal of the professional planners. All we can ask is that if this is so, let's be told about it, straight from the shoulder and not be hiding behind a serious and ever-present threat of war and devastation.

Two recent events ought to shake the complacency of the everyday citizen. First, Congress (the House) passed a subsidy for iron and zinc ranging from 1½ cents to 3 cents, at present market prices, per pound. The miners (owners and workers) protested. They did not want Government subsidy. They wanted and begged for Government protection against imports. They ask for one-half-cent-a-pound increase in tariffs; they would have settled for half a loaf and accepted just part of our own market by allowing foreign producers a quota of our needs. The answer was an emphatic "no." Instead of the traders paying the one-half cent tariff, the American taxpayer will pay 3 cents. It won't help a bit; it will cost us money, but the records show that there is no bottom in the selling price of foreign low-wage produced goods and apparently no ceiling on subsidies from our Treasury. So now we have the miner joining the farmer in the stockpile business.

The second event followed within a week of House action on subsidies for lead and zinc. The State Department negotiated another of its classic deals. There is a shortage of wheat in Canada and Australia because of adverse weather conditions, so they can't supply their domestic and world (full price) markets.

We have a "lotta wheat," so we make a deal with these two countries—\$10 million worth of our subsidized wheat for \$10 million worth of lead and zinc (100,000 tons). It doesn't seem to matter that we have lead and zinc coming out of our ears, stockpiles so high we have to subsidize our mines to keep our mines working because of the surplus of lead and zinc being dumped into this country by foreign countries, including both Canada and Australia.

One of the outstanding authorities of mines and minerals is the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, from the State of Colorado. In an appearance before my committee studying the impact of imports on American jobs, he had this to say:

"You will recall, Mr. Chairman, last week on the floor of the House when a bill was being considered for assistance to small producers in the lead and zinc industry, I detailed for the House the steady decline in employment in the lead-zinc industry. I think you will agree, after I have reviewed these details, that this job loss to American

industry is a direct result of our imports policy. Put another way, we have sacrificed our American jobs on the altar of our international trade policies.

"In 1952 there were 42,705 persons employed in the lead-zinc industry. The United States produced 390,162 tons of lead and 666,000 tons of zinc, for a total of 1,065,162 tons of lead and zinc; and consumed in the United States 1,130,795 tons of lead and 852,783 tons of slab zinc, or a total of 1,983,578 tons of lead and slab zinc. By 1956 domestic employment had been reduced to 33,706 Americans in a year when our domestic mine production had fallen off to 895,166 tons of lead and zinc, but our consumption rose to 2,218,507 tons of lead and slab zinc. It is important to note that the greatest decrease in employment (8,645) was in the mines and mills.

"By 1960, 20,000 jobs had been lost since 1952 in the lead-zinc industry overall with the mines and mills suffering the most. General imports of lead in 1960 amounted to 359,917 tons, or approximately 145 percent of the U.S. mine production of 246,869 tons; and general imports of zinc at 571,000 tons were 131 percent of the U.S. mine production of 435,427 tons.

"Although, as I have demonstrated, the lead-zinc industry has suffered a loss of employment in the United States because of import policies and practices, the Department of Defense, in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, has dismissed the industry as not needing assistance because there are now only 'a small number of miners' involved.

"Finally, I point out, although I am sure I do not have to remind you, that the effects are felt beyond each immediate industry, as for example, shutdowns of mines affects supply houses which also employ people; unemployment of miners affects those who sell consumer goods in mining areas; and the importation of the metals of foreign origin produced under adverse labor conditions acts as an excuse by which American employers seek to deprive American labor of benefits in this country in order to seek a competition position on the market."

"That's not all. We give the wheat at subsidized prices, and at the same time we arrange to sell it through American grain brokers to world markets. Why? Simply because this will give the two foreign countries American gold credits and we will probably pick up foreign counterpart (foreign money). It may not be so, but it wouldn't surprise anyone.

Why couldn't we sell the wheat to the nations that needed it? Why do we buy lead and zinc to add to our already overloaded warehouses and stockpiles?

If you can get an answer to these questions (honestly), you can get the blue ribbon and go to the head of the class.

A few years ago, under our foreign-aid program, we aided Korea by setting up a glass manufacturing plant. Recently, our committee heard of the results of this great help to our friends. The glass is being sold in Clarksburg, W. Va., while the Pittsburgh Plate in Clarksburg is laying off workers, and begging for tariff increases in Washington.

Apropos of this situation, the Tariff Commission, after years and years of pleading from the glass industry recommended that the tariff rates be increased. Not just a token increase, but rather a full retreat. After all the arguments over these many years, it recommended a tariff rate set up under the old Smoot-Hawley tariff law of over 30 years ago.

What happened? The normal thing in our world trade actions: Belgium, a large exporter to the United States, protested loud, long and effectively. They said they may be

forced to retaliation; they said that their sound economy was based upon controlling a certain share of the American domestic market for glass. The State Department jumped into the deal and you can guess whose side they took. They said we couldn't afford to raise tariffs on glass, we couldn't afford to offend Belgium right now because of the Berlin crisis.

The result: The President refused to accept the increased tariff recommendation by sending it back for further study.

Meanwhile, glass keeps coming in, workers get laid off their jobs, taxes increase and foreign aid builds more glass plants in Korea, Formosa and other needy nations.

This is just one example of building plants abroad with taxpayer's money and then taking the taxpayer's income away from him by importing the products from the plant his money built.

Someone said lately there are three ways now, instead of two ways, to get rich. They advise: Marry a rich woman, inherit a fortune or get the Government to build a factory for you overseas.

Recently, when we had a few days' strike at the docks, we were threatened with a gasoline ration because of the shortage of imported oil. For years, we've been importing so much oil that our exploration and production of American supplies has been drastically reduced.

Let's see what our own oil producers have to say about this situation:

"In Austin, Tex., members of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association (TIPRO) are set to meet tomorrow on the 'muddled' oil imports situation. TIPRO's president, J. F. West, in announcing the meeting hit the administration's current crude oil policy.

"He said: 'The recent maritime strike and the Kuwait crisis have once again forcibly demonstrated that a country that allows itself, through neglect or through planned policy, to become dependent on water-moved sources for vital raw materials has weakened its national defense posture.'

"... He also commented that 'at the same time, we realize the necessity of subjecting to the closest scrutiny any export proposal which might result in large volumes of crude oil or natural gas liquids entering U.S. markets at the expense of U.S. domestic production.'

"In the IPAA letter to Secretary Udall the association also called on the Interior Department to reverse the OIAB action which raised the crude oil import quota for Texaco, Inc., on the west coast."

In case of war, where will we get the ores, coal, oil, raincoats, watches, binoculars, typewriters, lighters, chairs, dishes, and on and on and on. This Nation is becoming a dependent nation upon others for its way of life.

We ask Congress to pass trade and aid bills in the name of making foreign countries independent and at the same time, we are making ourselves a second-rate producer of the necessities of life in this country. We are ourselves becoming dependent upon others not alone for our well-being, but perhaps for our survival.

We admit we cannot live alone in this complicated and troubled world. We must also admit that we can't live dependent upon others in this world complicated, troubled or otherwise.

As a fledgling nation, we had our troubles, our crisis, our one worlders, two worlders and no worlders. What did we do? We rebelled against being a colony providing raw materials and being used as a market by the mother country for the goods produced, from these raw materials.

We valued our markets, our industries, our labor, our farms, our institutions, and above all, our economic independence.

"We protected ourselves against the destruction of our production facilities and jobs by every means available including tariffs, treaties, quotas, embargoes, and statesmanship. Not the least of which was statesmanship.

One thing you can be sure of: If we had taken the same stand then as we have in recent years, there wouldn't have been any country or industry or jobs or farms to argue about.

Compare, if you will, the situation we have today with that of yesteryear. In growing years we protected American industry from foreign industry. Today we are busy protecting American industry from American industry.

Here's a classic example:

"An almost incredible drama—even in the present stage of development of our welfare state—is going on in bureaucratic Washington.

"One of the Nation's railways—by typical American ingenuity—has discovered a profitable way to effect a drastic reduction in selected freight rates * * * but the U.S. Government, at least temporarily won't give it permission to do so.

"Southern Railway has developed a super-duty 100-ton aluminum freight car * * * suitable for hauling grain efficiently and economically.

"Using this new equipment in multicar shipments, Southern can effect sizable economies in basic transportation costs, loading operations, terminal and transit switching, routing, paperwork, etc.

"As a result, the old rate of \$10.50 per net ton for grain movement from St. Louis to Gainesville, Ga., for example, can now be lowered to \$3.97, \$4.07, or \$4.17, depending on volume; and the railroad will still show a greater ton-mile profit than its present average on general freight movement.

"When the new rate was filed with the ICC, a lusty clamor arose from unregulated carriers adversely affected by such 'unfair competition.'

"Loud in support of their protests was the TVA which has spent \$200 million in making the Tennessee River navigable for barges carrying grain and other products.

"This taxpayer-endowed project has been of material assistance in putting the railroads out of the grain-carrying business.

"Now, when the railroads—with their own funds—attempt to fight back, TVA officials complain that any such cut in rates would 'disrupt efforts to create a Tennessee River common-carrier industry.'

"The new rates, which were to go into effect in August of this year, were filed by Southern with the ICC, but the Commission ordered that the reduction be suspended until March 1962, pending an investigation, on the grounds that the rates may be found to be 'unjust and unreasonable,' constituting 'unfair and destructive competitive practices.'

"Free enterprise made the United States the greatest, most powerful, most fruitful nation on earth."

This is labeled "unfair competition" because it is between American competitors while at the same time our markets are being flooded with every type of product and produce from every foreign shore at prices that don't even meet our cost of production. In fact, sometimes it doesn't even meet the cost of the raw materials and certainly never meets our labor costs.

When are we going to realize that trade is a profit-seeking venture? No person outside of dreamers and persons in Government-protected jobs without responsibility for creating jobs or production believes trade, internal or external, to be other than a greedy, mercenary, profiteering enterprise.

Clark Urges Firmness in Dealing With Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I was delighted to see in the Washington Evening Star of September 13, 1961, an article by Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army retired, which points out the need for firmness in our dealings with the Communists. General Clark is well known for his exploits during World War II and the Korean war and presently serves as president of the Military College of South Carolina, The Citadel, in Charleston, S.C. He speaks as one who has had many dealings with the Communists, as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria, as deputy to the Secretary of State in London and Moscow in 1947, and at the Panmunjom negotiations. General Clark has served his country with distinction in these varied capacities and speaks with convincing authority. Our officials would do well to pay heed to these words of wisdom. I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Clark Urges Firmness in Dealing with Reds," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARK URGES FIRMNESS IN DEALING WITH REDS

(By Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army (retired))
CHARLESTON, S.C., September 13.—My country has given me many opportunities to observe the Communists firsthand.

While I commanded the 5th Army in Italy during World War II, a group of Russian officer observers was attached to my staff. Their political adviser was Andrei Vishinsky, who organized Communist activities in areas that our forces liberated.

At the end of the war, as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria for 2 years, I negotiated with Marshal I. S. Konev, the Soviet High Commissioner, who recently has been placed in command of the Soviet Armies in East Germany.

In 1947 I faced Communist negotiators across the conference table in London where I served as Deputy to the U.S. Secretary of State, and in the same capacity I sat in the Moscow Council of Foreign Ministers in 1947 with Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State.

Later on during the Korean conflict, when I was commander in chief, Far East and United Nations Commands, I came to grips with Communist tactics at Panmunjom during negotiations which led to the military armistice agreement for Korea which I finally signed on July 27, 1953.

USED SAME TACTICS

I found the Communists used the same obstructionist tactics everywhere I encountered them.

In Austria all communications lines from Vienna to the American zone were through corridors set up and controlled by the Russians and agreed to by the Allied Governments. The corridors passed through 110 miles of Russian occupied territory. There was one corridor by air, one by road, and one by rail.

The situation was identical to the present one in Berlin.

The air corridor was narrow between Vienna and our sector. Russian warplanes began crowding us inside this corridor. Sometimes they fired on our planes, and one, a Russian warplane, fired on the airplane in which I was flying. When I found protests to Marshal Konev to be futile, I ordered American planes flying the corridor to be armed and ordered our airmen to fire on any Russian plane that made a menacing move inside the corridor. I so informed Marshal Konev in writing. Never again did the Russians challenge us inside that corridor.

We had something of the same problem with trains. The Russians often halted our train, the Mozart Express, when it went through their zone between our headquarters in Vienna and our zone in Salzburg.

I followed the usual pattern of repeated protests to Marshal Konev, and, as usual, he took no action. Finally, he was warned formally that our military police had been ordered to keep Russian soldiers off our trains.

Shortly thereafter several Red army officers and enlisted men forced their way aboard the train. As a result, T. Sgt. Shirley B. Dixon, of our military police, shot one Russian officer dead and wounded another who tried to draw his gun.

The Russians violently protested the shooting, but the interruptions in our train service ceased.

These and many similar experiences I had with Communists around the world demonstrated to me the necessity of using unmistakable determination when dealing with representatives of the Kremlin.

An incident involving Danube River barges illustrates, however, that we did not always follow this policy. Shortly after our arrival in Austria, the Russians stopped all shipping on the Danube. About that time I found that all Austrian, Yugoslav-Hungarian, and other river barges had been moved up to Linz by the Germans in the closing days of the war. Therefore, they were in the American zone.

BOUNDARY EXTENDED

The Russians persuaded Washington to extend their boundary to the Danube in the Linz area; so I moved the barges farther up river to the American zone of Germany for safekeeping. I sensed that they would be an ace up our sleeve in bargaining with the Communists because barges would be essential when river traffic was resumed.

The Communists almost immediately pressured us to return the barges. On a trip back to Washington, I discussed the barges and gained the impression that everyone concerned, including President Truman, agreed that we should hold them. At a conference with me the President said, "Mark, I heartily agree with you. You hang on to those barges."

Upon my return to Vienna, however, I received a message from the State Department, instructing me to return the Yugoslav barges. I replied that I was under the distinct impression that I had approval for holding the barges as a bargaining point. The Secretary of State said to turn the barges over to the Yugoslavs. I turned them over.

MANY SIMILAR INCIDENTS

There have been many similar incidents in our dealings with the Communists. They demonstrate that strength and determination are two things Communists respect and, skillfully applied, will prevent communism from achieving its goal of world domination that today threatens free people everywhere.

Fortunately, there seems to be a refreshing awakening to this fact. This is indicated by strengthening our military posture, and by the firm stand that President Kennedy has taken on the Berlin issue. His reinforcing our Berlin garrison and his forth-

right statement concerning the consequences of interfering with free Allied access to Berlin are the kinds of actions the Russians understand.

His sending Vice President JOHNSON and Gen. Lucius D. Clay to bolster the morale of the West Germans and demonstrate our vested interest in Berlin was also the kind of action that will not be lost on the Communists.

It is my hope that this approach signals that America has awakened, and that our country will pursue a courageous policy for firmness. Without such a policy we can never effectively negotiate with the Communists.

Marshal Konev once revealed their frustrating negotiating technique to me at a party in Vienna. After he had a couple of drinks of vodka, I asked him what would happen if the following morning I accepted all the preposterous Soviet demands then under discussion.

He laughed and said he would have 10 new ones to submit to me the next day.

In the face of such truculence, the free world must remain steadfast.

Let us have peace in our time, but not at the price of Communist slavery for ensuing generations.

The Family Fallout Shelter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully call the attention of the Members to what I hope will set a precedent for the towns and villages across our land. Through the urging of August Stout, town supervisor, the town of Brookhaven, Long Island, N.Y., has provided a typical family fallout shelter on the grounds of the Town Hall, built for general demonstration from specifications drawn up by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and fully equipped as recommended by that agency.

At 2 o'clock next Monday, September 18, one of our local townsmen will start demonstrating its livability to the public at large through radio broadcasts during his week's tenancy, in which he will describe his reactions while living there, closed off from the rest of the world and dependent entirely on the food and equipment he finds therein.

Since the beginning of September we have been appalled by the insane irresponsibility of the Soviet Union in setting off one atomic blast after another, spewing radioactive debris into the atmosphere with complete disregard for the future of the human race. Today's newspapers carry the latest poll on what the American people feel their chances of survival in all-out nuclear attack are, demonstrating their grim realization of the extreme dangers involved, and of their limited hopes for survival.

Walter Lippmann writes in his column:

Though nuclear war would be lunacy and is unlikely, it is an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however irrational it may be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to a point where its nervous system cannot endure inaction,

where only violence can relieve its feelings. . . . There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which the reactions are uncontrollable Here lies the greatest danger of miscalculation, and therefore of war.

My mail is beginning to reflect the growing concern of the American people. One constituent tells me he is going ahead with his own fallout shelter. "This," he tells me, "I believe is the true American way. The Government is there to support, but not to substitute, for individual initiative."

We all share the nightmare feeling that we are hurtling toward total oblivion at an ever faster pace. Let us hope it is only a nightmare from which we will awaken. But meanwhile let us give our families every protection we can; let each community show its inhabitants how to construct a fallout shelter, as the town of Brookhaven is doing.

The Consequences of Nuclear War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, all-out nuclear war would bring not only death and destruction but an end to the world we know. Mr. Walter Lippmann in his column published in this morning's Washington Post states simply and logically what the consequences of such a war would be, and how different it would be from any other war fought in the world's history. But, Mr. President, Mr. Lippmann's sobering essay needs no interpretative remarks from me or any one else. The message which he delivers should be heard by everyone on this earth. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUCLEAR DIPLOMACY (By Walter Lippmann)

Never before have any chiefs of state been in a situation like that in Germany today. For this is the first encounter on vital issues between great nuclear powers, and there are no historical precedents, there is no accumulated experience and wisdom to guide them. Khrushchev and Kennedy possess what are for all practical purposes equal and absolute weapons. Khrushchev and Kennedy, Macmillan, De Gaulle, and Adenauer are working under conditions as different from World War II as flying a jet is different from running a steam locomotive. None of them has been taught how to conduct diplomacy in a nuclear age. All of them have to guess and to improvise, to experiment, and to hope.

There has been a revolution in the military situation since the previous encounter over Berlin with Stalin in 1948. Then the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But beginning with the late fifties the Soviet Union with its nuclear weapons and its rockets has become an equal nuclear power. During the critical fifties Churchill and Eisenhower learned what was

happening to the balance of power. Then the era of summity began. At the beginning of this era Eisenhower made the statement for which, it may well be, he will be remembered, the longest. It was not sentimentality, idealism, or pacifism but the grim truth about the hydrogen bomb which caused President Eisenhower to say that there is no longer any "alternative to peace."

Modern weapons have not merely magnified and multiplied the violence of war. They have revolutionized the nature of war by introducing into it a new order of violence. Always until now, war and the threat of war, whether aggressive or defense, were usable instruments for the national purpose. They were usable because wars could still be won or lost. In the prenuclear wars the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. The damage, though great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union. But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean a 100 million dead, the devastation of the great urban centers, and the contamination of the earth, the water and the air, there would be no such recovery. The damage done would be mutual, there would be no victor, and for all practical purposes the ruin would be irreparable.

American nuclear power can reduce Soviet society to smoldering ruins and leave the wretched survivors shocked, starving, and diseased. The Soviet Union can, it is coolly estimated, kill between 30 and 70 million Americans. Such a war would not be followed by reconstruction. It would be followed by a savage struggle for existence as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the American Republic would be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

It used to be said of the British naval commander in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the war in an afternoon. Khrushchev and Kennedy can do that now. In a few hours Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the achievements and the promises of the Communist economy; Kennedy can lose the Constitution and the free enterprise system and the American way of life, and along with them all the frontiers, old and new. I do not think that this is overstated. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred since man appeared on this planet. In saying this my object is not to add to the general creepiness. But we cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter unless we remind ourselves that nuclear war is not just another war as history describes war, but a wholly new order of violence.

Because the destructiveness of the new armaments is equal and virtually absolute neither of the two chiefs of government can threaten the other with such a war. As long as each has kept his own armory of weapons in order, neither can or need believe the nuclear threats of the other. If, for example, Khrushchev has resumed testing, not for technical military reasons but for terrorization, he will not and cannot terrorize President Kennedy. For this testing cannot remove the awful retaliatory power of the U.S. nuclear weapon systems.

In cold blood, no government can, no government will, start a nuclear war with an equal nuclear power. Only a moral idiot would press the button. The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough and now let us drop the bomb have no idea what they are talking about. They have not been able to imagine and realize what a nuclear war would be like. But the governments know quite well what a nuclear war would be like. That is why there is bluff

at the core of any threat to initiate a nuclear exchange. There is also a wishful belief that the bluff will work, because it will not be called.

Nevertheless, though a nuclear war would be lunacy and is unlikely, it is an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however irrational it may be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to a point where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings.

This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. It is as much a reality as a megaton bomb, and in the nuclear age it must be given weighty consideration in the calculation of policy. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which the reactions are uncontrollable. The governments must know where that line is, and they must stay well back of it. Here lies the greatest danger of miscalculation and, therefore, of war.

Both sides, we had better realize, are capable of miscalculating where that line is. Khrushchev, who has no sufficient experience of a state whose speech is free, is prone to think that Kennedy can and should control an explosion of popular feeling. The fact is that there is a limit to President Kennedy's ability to lead public opinion, and he is in sight of that limit. Mr. Khrushchev must make no mistake about this.

For our part, we are prone to suppose that because speech is strictly regimented in the Soviet Union, that there are no irresistible internal pressures on Khrushchev. This can be a very dangerous illusion.

In both countries there is a line which it is not safe for the other to cross. It is the line where compromise will be regarded as humiliation and surrender. This line will have to be made precise in the negotiations. Blockade of the access routes is such a line for this country. For the Soviet Union such a line would be the giving of nuclear arms to West Germany. These are lines of provocation which cannot be crossed without provoking uncontrollable, indeed suicidal, reactions.

This being the nuclear age it is the paramount rule of international politics that a great nuclear power must not put another great nuclear power in a position where it must choose between suicide and surrender. And the corollary of this rule is that no great nuclear power must put itself in a position where it has made such absolute and such rigid stipulations that it can no longer negotiate an honorable and tolerable accommodation.

More Jobs Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following most interesting editorial which appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Item on September 11, 1961:

MORE JOBS NEEDED

Massachusetts needs more jobs to support her expanding population.

Instead of the 723,000 manufacturing jobs we should have at this time, latest figures show only 678,960 persons employed—a shortage of 44,000 jobs in one category alone.

Instead of rising employment, there has been a net loss of 5,200 jobs in private employment between June 1959, and June 1961.

A drive to find new investment funds must begin immediately if this trend is to be reversed, in the belief of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

Executive Vice President Robert A. Chadbourne, addressing a recent seminar at Amherst, said at least 90,000 new manufacturing jobs need to be created. And these jobs can be created only through new industrial investment.

To carry the picture further, new investment money can be secured only with a drive for sound, responsible financing of the State government, a taxation spread over a broad base and minimum government regulation of business.

There are all sort of opportunities for imaginative, bold people in the field of manufacturing, but they must be assured that their efforts won't be choked and harassed by government practices that discourage rather than encourage industrial initiative.

City of Hartford Resolution on Gambling Syndicates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution forwarded to me by the clerk of the city of Hartford, strongly supporting the series of proposals recently submitted to the Congress by Attorney General Robert Kennedy to combat syndicated gambling offenses.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY OF HARTFORD,
SEPTEMBER 12, 1961

This is to certify that a meeting of the court of common council held September 11, 1961, the following resolution was passed by rollcall vote.

Whereas lack of public information and understanding of the serious and threatening nature of the well-organized, illegal, professional gambling syndicates enables them to continue their criminal activities which undermines community stability and welfare; and

Whereas the Hartford Courant's recent excellent series of articles on syndicated gambling, written by Mr. Irving Kravsov, focused public attention on the cancerous influence of these activities on the life of our city, State, and Nation; and

Whereas these articles point up loopholes which exist in State and Federal laws which permit masterminds of these syndicates to avoid State and Federal prosecution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the court of common council hereby goes on record as commending the Hartford Courant and Mr. Kravsov for this timely and important series; and be it further

Resolved, That this council goes on record as supporting the series of proposals recently submitted to Congress by Attorney General Robert Kennedy to combat syndicated

gambling and directs the town clerk to so advise all Members of the Congress from Connecticut.

Attest:

ROBERT J. GALLIVAN,
City Clerk.

The West Needs Steady Nerves as the Russians Play With Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently an editorial appeared in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, entitled, "The West Needs Steady Nerves as the Russians Play With Fire."

I ask unanimous consent to have this thought-provoking article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal,
Aug. 25, 1961]

THE WEST NEEDS STEADY NERVES AS THE RUSSIANS PLAY WITH FIRE

Just as it appeared that the Russians were going to permit an easing of Berlin tensions which would have smoothed the way for negotiations with the Allied Powers, the tensions are again increased, this time to a dangerous degree. The attempt of the Communist military leaders in East Berlin to control the conduct of West Berliners near the boundary of the Eastern sector was in itself highly provocative. But the latest Soviet note, hinting at possible Communist efforts to restrict or cut off allied air access to Berlin, bears far more serious implications.

The allied powers cannot afford to be unduly influenced by the obvious implications of the Russian charge that the air-access routes to West Berlin are being used to carry "spies and provocateurs" to the city. They cannot afford to show the slightest weakening in their insistence on their rights, conceded by the Russians in the agreements of 1949, to unrestricted access. And it is inconceivable that they would agree to give the Soviets the right to say who shall and shall not be carried on planes traveling between the city and West Germany.

To do so would effectively cripple air travel to the city from the West, and that the allies cannot afford. Indeed, the most disturbing aspect of the Russian note is its implied threat that the Russians may be preparing to interfere with our use of the specified air corridors between West Germany and West Berlin. As the British point out, this is the first time that the Russians have challenged Western rights to use of the corridor, or the right to decide who shall use it. And there is a possibility, which must be considered, that the Russians are preparing to attempt a closing of the corridor on the pretext of clarifying the legal aspects of our access rights.

A FRIGHTENING PROSPECT

This is, as the British appreciate, a frightening prospect. For if we can be cut off from air access to West Berlin, it will be an easy matter for the Russians to find that the highway needs drastic repairs, that the roadbed of the railroad is unsafe for transit and that the water routes must be shut

down for overhaul. As we found in the instance of the airlift of 1949, only the air does not lend itself to physical blockade short of actual shooting. And if the air routes can be closed, West Berlin can be effectively isolated, and our position made desperate. It is quite likely, as the British fear, that we would be obligated to fight our way through the corridor rather than surrender it.

It is difficult to believe that it is the Russian intention to force us into this position. More likely, it seems that their latest move is primarily intended for propaganda purposes, for the neutral nations are aware of the Soviet fears concerning West Germany, and to maintain the tensions in Berlin. The object of this is, of course, to make Berlin a nuisance, and such a potentially dangerous nuisance that the Western Allies will be glad to settle for Khrushchev's demands that East Germany be recognized, along with its present borders, and that Berlin be made a free city.

It is not likely to succeed if Western nerves hold steady, and all indications from Washington, Paris, and London are that they will. As a propaganda move, however, the threat may have been more effective, as indicated by Indian Prime Minister Nehru's suggestion that the Western rights of access were not unlimited. The Russians could use a propaganda victory at this time. Their Berlin Chinese Wall has proved a serious propaganda handicap throughout the neutral world, and an admission of weakness that has left the Russians and their East German puppets smarting.

MORE PRESSURE TO COME

They will undoubtedly now attempt pressures to force the West to negotiate its present rights of air access, with a view to forbidding transport of West Germans into West Berlin. If this, and their desire for continued tensions, is the only reason for this threatening move, the position of the West and the danger represented by Berlin is unchanged. But the willingness of the Soviets to move so crudely into such sensitive and potentially explosive areas indicates the constant danger of Berlin, the danger that someone may blunder, that some accident may spark the fatal clash. It is a time for steady nerves, and calm preparation for negotiation.

Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker Denied Right of Self-Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a great injustice has been done to a real American, Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker. This man who has dared to speak for what America stands for has, in effect, been charged with an unpatriotic deed, and at the same time, denied the opportunity to fully refute the charges made against him in the press. This injustice must be corrected. The Kennedy administration must allow this great American to defend himself.

There appeared in the September 12, 1961, issue of the New York Mirror, an editorial concerning this injustice to General Walker which I think should be

printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all Members of Congress to see. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE WALKER CASE

Daily the excitement over the General Walker case attracts more attention and every time anyone in the Pentagon issues a public release on the subject, it becomes clearer that someone blundered and the coverup is inadequate.

As a matter of fact, there need be no coverup. No matter how it is sliced, General Walker seems to have committed the crime of being excessively patriotic, of preferring his own country to Soviet Russia, and of finding the Communist system offensive to the ideals of an American.

A newspaper, published for American troops overseas, particularly in Germany, resented General Walker's problue program of pro-American indoctrination. The Pentagon got excited, relieved General Walker from his command, gave him a reduced position and, in effect, reprimanded him.

As it stands, it looks as though a reputable officer is being sacrificed to some absurd policy. It can develop into as great a blot on the Kennedy administration as the Cuban fiasco. And probably the same doctrinaire amateurs are responsible.

General Walker is entitled to a trial by his peers, properly a court-martial, preferably in public. He is entitled to defend his honor and his integrity. Every American is entitled to that. Congressional committees would like to give General Walker a hearing but the Pentagon keeps him away from this country.

It is cruel and un-American to charge a soldier with a felony or a misdemeanor or even bad judgment without giving him a hearing. General Walker has had no hearing.

Teachers as Recruiters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of our country's greatest problems today is the shortage of qualified teachers for our schoolchildren. In order to fill these vacancies, there is a vital need for developing interest early among the young people as to the opportunities that exist in the teaching profession.

The State education commissioner, in the State of New York, Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., has advanced a nine-point program to meet this shortage. I concur in the observations made by the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., in a recent editorial which follows:

TEACHERS AS RECRUITERS

Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., State education commissioner, gave Buffalo teachers this week a nine-point program for overcoming the statewide shortage of qualified teachers. Topping the list was a plea for more intensive recruitment efforts to seek young people with potential teaching talent and to attract them into the profession.

Systematic recruiting obviously must be backed up by the other items Dr. Allen

ticked off—strengthening teacher courses, improving certification standards, removing unnecessary barriers to potentially gifted teachers, promoting material rewards, encouraging more efficient use of teaching time, etc. But just as obviously, such steps can't produce more teachers unless the youngsters coming up through the high schools get every encouragement for teaching as a career.

For that reason we are glad that Dr. Allen bore down hard on the "constructive efforts" teachers themselves must make to advance their profession. For who, after all, is in a better position to promote the teaching career among teenagers than teachers themselves?

They have vast opportunity to nourish youthful enthusiasm for the profession they chose by upgrading it at every chance, by taking pride and accenting the positive in their mission as molders of character and communicators of culture.

By the same token, nothing more surely can sour students on a teaching career than a negative attitude in the classroom, or by harping on the "downtrodden" refrain that teachers aren't moving up rapidly enough in material rewards. In a State whose minimum salary scales have advanced markedly in recent years—with most teachers in this area well above the prevailing minimums throughout the salary scale—no teacher need be bashful about portraying the educator's career in positive terms.

Niel J. Bulger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with profound regret I report the recent death of an able newspaperman and close friend, Mr. Niel J. Bulger, editor of the Waterbury (Conn.), Sunday Republican and author of a widely read column, "The Yankee Pedlar."

Mr. Bulger, who devoted his entire life to the newspaper profession as a reporter and editor, was a strong influence for progress in the areas served by his newspapers. His untimely death leaves this area infinitely poorer at a time when we can ill afford such a loss.

I met Niel during the first few days that he was in Waterbury and we were firm friends from that time until his death. His passing is a personal loss.

He had a wide and devoted public following and his influence was strongly felt because he always looked for and fostered the first rate in journalism, in literature and in politics.

Although he assumed something of the drawing diction in the caustic wit of the Yankee Pedlar for whom his column was named he was truly warm hearted and generous. And one is overwhelmed on looking back over the years to realize the good causes that he espoused and the number of civic projects he worked wholeheartedly for.

With unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an edi-

torial which appeared in the Sunday, September 11, edition of the Waterbury (Conn.), Republican which is an able and well-rounded portrait of Niel Bulger:

NIEL J. BULGER

(The late Sunday editor of the Republican was a discerning chronicler of the engrossing bustle that went on around him and a kindly one.)

The essential quality of a good newspaperman is a keen interest in life and in people. Niel Bulger had that interest to a marked degree. Among members of his craft he stood out because of a never-flagging curiosity as to what makes people and things tick. He was forever digging into the why and the how of events, and the fascinating puzzle of personalities. Because of his long observation of politics, government was for him the center of life's three-ring circus and he was thoroughly at home in caucus, convention, and little smoke-filled rooms—in legislature and board meetings. But the other rings engrossed him, too. The whole range of such human behavior as would be newsmill grist attracted him. And this broadened interest was reflected in the fine account he gave of himself when a highly competent reporter was converted into an equally able feature editor.

There is supposed to be the seed of cynicism in the kind of backstage look that an observant reporter gets at the frailties and composites of public life, and of life not so public. But although Niel knew occasions for exercise of his always healthy skepticism, there was a warmth, a friendliness, a constant desire to be helpful in his contacts with people which made him a veritable host of friends. There was no mean bone in his body. In community service and on the State boards he played the part of good citizen and among his friends and fellow workers there was no better companion.

Results of a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed a questionnaire to registered-voter households in the 30th Congressional District of California. Over 100,000 questionnaires were sent out, and I am pleased to report that nearly 20,000 completed questionnaires were returned.

In my opinion, the folks back home in my congressional district, or any other congressional district in the country, are way ahead of Washington in their thoughts on the important issues facing the Nation. The results of this questionnaire confirm this premise.

A close analysis of the response to the 16 questions submitted to my constituency reveals clear and precise opinions on matters vital to the future of the United States.

I am very proud to submit herewith the tabulated results of my annual legislative questionnaire:

Questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Should Red China be admitted to the U.N.?	10	87	3
2. Should Red China be recognized diplomatically by the United States?	16	80	4
3. Are you willing to pay 5 cents instead of 4 cents to mail a letter to help end the postal deficit?	69	27	4
4. Do you favor Federal Aid to Education for—			
(a) School Construction?	40	44	16
(b) Teachers' salaries?	23	59	18
(c) Areas only which are "impacted" by defense activities?	42	35	23
(d) None at all?	11	34	55
5. Should the farm price-support program be scrapped entirely?	66	27	7
6. Should the Geneva nuclear test ban talks be ended?	61	34	5
7. Should the social security law be amended to include medical care for the aged?	49	48	3
8. Should there be a withholding tax and interest on savings accounts and on corporate dividends?	18	78	4
9. Should the United States resume testing nuclear weapons underground?	86	9	5
10. When you first heard President Kennedy was going to Vienna to talk with Khrushchev, did you think it a good idea?	38	59	3
11. Now that the Vienna talks have occurred, do you think the outcome was—			
(a) More favorable to the United States than the U.S.S.R.?	8	30	62
(b) More favorable to the U.S.S.R. than the United States?	23	15	62
(c) About even?	34	13	63
(d) Nothing accomplished?	42	26	32
12. In general, do you feel there are enough laws restraining business?	82	14	4
13. In general, do you feel there are enough laws restraining labor unions?	11	87	2
14. How would you vote on the following recommendations President Kennedy made to Congress in his May 25 speech?			
(a) Send a man to the moon and back by 1970 and spend an additional \$7,000,000,000 to \$9,000,000,000 during the next 5 years toward doing it.	44	51	5
(b) Boost foreign aid program by \$535,000,000, to bring total foreign aid spending to \$2,650,000,000 for the next year.	21	74	5
(c) Triple spending on civil defense (fallout shelters, warning measures, food stockpiles, etc.) to about \$312,000,000.	56	38	6
(d) Spend \$121,000,000 next year for the U.S. Information Agency to disseminate information overseas.	57	35	8
(e) Increase Army and Marine Corps strength to meet brush-fire situations; increase nonnuclear firepower and guerilla training.	89	7	4
(f) Establish a strengthened and enlarged U.S. Disarmament Administration.	20	68	12
(g) Give the President a \$250,000,000 contingency fund for flexible response to new, but as yet unknown, crises and opportunities occurring overseas during the next year.	39	56	5
15. Is the United States in a nonmilitary war with communism which could end in total victory for either side without ever firing a shot? (If you answered "yes," please answer the following:)	85	9	6
(a) Do Americans generally realize we are fighting it now?	22	68	10
(b) Is our Government organized to fight it effectively?	8	78	14
(c) Are we putting enough skill and effort into it?	4	84	12
(d) Are we winning?	4	79	17
(e) Does winning possibly involve higher taxes and foregoing for a while some desirable domestic programs?	70	17	13
16. Do you favor sending armed forces to Cuba to get rid of Castro without waiting any longer?	64	30	6

Defense Department Ignores Economies of Using the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I called attention to a communication that was made by the Midwestern Senators to Secretary of Defense McNamara.

Today there came to my desk from H. C. Brockel, municipal park director of the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners, an article entitled "Defense Department Ignores Economies of Using Seaway," which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal under date of September 11, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT IGNORES ECONOMIES OF USING SEAWAY

As a huge overseas shipper—12 million tons last year—the Defense Department still astonishingly ignores the economic advantages of the St. Lawrence Seaway. All 12 Senators from Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin are now pressing this point upon Secretary McNamara.

Defense, they object, persists in its old shipping pattern of Atlantic, gulf, and west coast transportation commands. Though millions of tons of its overseas cargo originate in the great industrial midcontinent, it

moved only 70,000 last year—less than six-tenths of 1 percent of its total—through the adjacent ocean ports on the Great Lakes.

It continues this slow dribble even though it acknowledged saving \$638,000 on a 91,000-ton seaway movement in the very first season, 2 years ago. In contrast to that \$7 a ton, the Senators base their case on a very modest savings estimate of \$1 to \$3.

Bigger military shipments would be a boon to Great Lakes ports, but this is no pork barrel. The Senators are not asking for more gravy to be spread among their home States. They simply want cold, hard business done with the Nation's tax money. The Senators merely ask McNamara to put the matter to the test, and see for himself. Create a separate Great Lakes transportation command. Route a specified minimum tonnage—say, 500,000—through Great Lakes ports next season at fairly proportional rail rates. Study comparative costs of shipments to and through the ports in all four transportation commands.

Certainly the seaway would thereby prove itself the most economical outlet for a great deal more military cargo than now goes through it. To the fullest extent of this proof, it should thereupon be used. Could anything make more obvious sense?

Is Anticommunism Now To Be Considered Anti-Americanism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, some strange new developments are indeed

taking place in the administration's position toward those who dare to speak out to help identify communism for the pagan, international conspiracy that it actually is.

First, we witness the severe punishment of General Walker and next we note the official censorship of a career official in the U.S. Forest Service by name of Don Caron. After 15 years of distinguished service in the U.S. Forest Service, Caron was confronted with the alternative of discontinuing to speak and write educational articles against communism or resigning his position. As a patriotic, courageous American more interested in his country's survival than his personal welfare, Caron resigned. Thus the voices of Walker and Caron have been silenced in the crusade against communism but the perils provided by the activities of Communists at home and abroad grow greater and more alarming.

Nationally recognized columnist and writer, George E. Sokolsky has taken recognition of this unfortunate and untimely effort of officials in the Kennedy administration to drive into silence those who feel impelled to speak out against the evils of communism. He discusses this development cogently in a column entitled "It Starts Again" which I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

I sincerely hope the anticipated investigation by the Senate Armed Services Committee under the able leadership of Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, will get to the source and the reasons for this new era of censorship. In these perilous times we need a greater rather than a lesser understanding of the true

scope and nature of the Communist menace. We shall not win the cold war nor avert a hot one by turning our backs to the fire, and burying our heads in the sand.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT STARTS AGAIN
(By George Sokolsky)

There can be little doubt but a strong investigation into anticommunism is developing in the U.S. Senate. The General Walker case will not down, and either the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, or a public court-martial is essential to clean it up. Secretary of Defense McNamara's defense of the removal of General Walker from his post was insufficient because it avoided the central issue which is that pro-Communists are beginning to move about freely again.

It is interesting that the leader in the present battle against the pro-Communists is Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina. Senator KARL MUNDT has joined but that is to have been expected because he has been active in anti-Communist movements since he has been in the Congress.

The General Walker case is arousing interest because he has been accused of a crime which is not recognizable as such. The accusation is that his pro-blue program of patriotic indoctrination was excessive. It is impossible to define why he should have been accused of impropriety without being given a public hearing.

By avoiding a public hearing, the Defense Department has got itself into an untenable position. An organization, "The Friends of General Walker," has come into being which is circulating publications, mimeographed and printed, on the subject. Although generally the press has not paid too much attention to the General Walker case, the pamphleteers have been busy, and they note the silence of the press.

It is my experience that the suppression of a story can build it up to explosive proportions. This seems to be best pointed up in Senator MUNDT's weekly report. MUNDT is a Republican; THURMOND is a Democrat. Nevertheless, MUNDT uses THURMOND as his authority when he says:

"In the August 17 discussion on the Senate floor concerning the memorandum submitted by Senator FULBRIGHT to the Defense Department and the subsequent directive aimed at stopping anti-Communist seminars, Senator STROM THURMOND said: 'I think our people in uniform should not speak promiscuously on all subjects, but they are entitled to tell the civilian population the aims, the methods of operation, and the dangers of the enemy. The enemy today is communism. I feel there is a censorship now being placed upon our military people with regard to expressing themselves concerning our enemy, communism.'"

Senator MUNDT attacks the censorship of public speeches by military men:

"Thus, the full impact of the recent Pentagon directive is now being felt. The muzzling of the military, first appearing as an innocent attempt to stop war talk by such distinguished military leaders as Adm. Arleigh Burke, becomes an all-out attack to discredit highly successful anti-Communist seminars and to eliminate any reference to the menace of communism because it is interpreted as being of a political nature."

This is the beginning of a movement and those who ignore it do not understand the strength and depth of popular movements. It is easy to ridicule the John Birch Society, but it is not easy to justify the removal of General Walker from his post in Germany on the grounds of excessive patriotism.

The excuse can be that the balance between the United States and Soviet Russia, between war and peace, is so fine that only the most elevated officials should speak on policy matters. That would be President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. But we listen to others on lower levels discuss policy questions and they are not muzzled.

There seems to be a misunderstanding of roles and responsibilities. If no one but the President and the Secretary of State are to speak on policy, then let everybody else be silent. It is doubtful if the country would long tolerate such a one-sided silence.

Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a column by Richard Starnes which appeared in the Columbus Citizen-Journal on Monday, September 10, 1961.

It is my thought every Member of Congress should have the benefit of the views expressed by Mr. Starnes:

LEADERS

(By Richard Starnes)

NEW YORK.—Every epoch of human history is taught us by the symbolic shorthand of heroes, until it is possible to defend the proposition that no civilization ever achieved greatness without producing great leaders.

When we think of the awakening of England and its first tremendous strides toward world dominion, we think of Elizabeth I. And, of course, when we think of the sad remains of that nation, we think of Elizabeth II, a dowdy, foolish woman who perfectly symbolizes the emptiness and lack of purpose of her people.

The fall of France was plainly foreshadowed by the incredible bankruptcy in her leadership. The salvation of Britain was Churchill. The mad genius of Hitler was the catalyst that revitalized Germany.

What sort of symbolic shorthand will historians of the future use to tell unborn generations what sort of people their midcentury ancestors in the United States were?

If, as I suppose they will, these unborn scholars continue to use the same sort of historical shorthand we use, I am afraid our generation of Americans will come off rather poorly. The sad truth of the matter is that we are almost bereft of any useful leadership, much less any leadership of flashing genius, or even the sort of low utilitarian cunning such as Khrushchev possesses.

The United States last presidential campaign was an unexampled convulsion of mediocrity. The winner won principally because he was a young man of startling physical beauty while his opponent always managed to look like a used car salesman with a bad hangover.

I am not sure the crisis of America is entirely a crisis of leadership. It is at least partly a crisis of slothful, egocentric, materialistic population that is pitted against a people who are young, tough and hungry.

Every magazine that comes to hand is full of "explanations" of the disaster we met in the Bay of Pigs, but the real explanation is simply that we lacked the moral courage to go ahead with an unpleasant task. We could

not get on with the surgery necessary in Cuba, the rationalizers insisted, because the seething, unwashed masses in the world wouldn't like it.

I don't give a damn what any heathen dwelling in a foul-smelling mud hut thinks. One free American is worth any number of surly, unclean, wife-beating, daughter-selling peasants in any "emerging" nation, and it is time we began to understand it.

If we are destined to be the people whom history will indict for letting the torch of freedom fall from our nerveless fingers, so be it. But can't we summon one last echo of our past and do it like men?

The Christian Faith and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a commission of the National Lutheran Council recently made a statement prepared after 2 years of study on the subject of "The Christian Faith and Foreign Aid." The council, which is an agency of six Lutheran groups with 5½ million members went on record as favoring increased foreign aid, with long-range realistic planning, and with special attention to the roles of the United Nations and private investment. Because their statement embodies so many of the ideas and thoughts expressed in the foreign aid measure recently passed by the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON FOREIGN AID

(A) In the conviction that God, in the outpouring of His love, unites mankind in common responsibility; calls each person to serve his neighbor with the abilities and means which have been given to him; seeks for all nations and peoples the opportunity to develop their God-given potentialities under conditions favorable to their wholesome development;

In recognition of the pressing need for aid and cooperation in the less developed areas of the world among peoples striving for economic, social, and political development; the demonstrated effectiveness of governmental programs of economic and technical aid in furthering the wholesome development of peoples and nations; the conviction that responsible, self-reliant initiative and enterprise are expected of men and nations and that long-continued dependency impoverishes; and

In light of the beliefs and conditions set forth in the preceding text, the national Lutheran Council recommends to its participating bodies that by appropriate means they point out to their members that economic and technical aid to less developed areas is essentially a demand of justice and in harmony with the Christian faith; help their members to study the subject of mutual aid among the nations and thereupon to express themselves as responsible Christian citizens with respect to these programs, making their views known to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, their Senators

and Congressmen, and to other leaders and agencies; challenge their qualified members to undertake dedicated and competent service in the less developed areas of the world as a part of their Christian vocation, and guide their youth to see these opportunities and to become qualified for such service; evaluate current studies on the problems of areas of rapid social change and make feasible plans to insure that through the necessary insights, personnel, and funds the churches and their agencies play their part in dealing imaginatively and creatively with the opportunities and difficulties that emerge through the impact of rapid social change; and encourage their members and agencies to participate in "exchange of persons" programs of the church, other voluntary agencies, and Government, in particular welcoming such persons who come into their communities.

(B) Recognizing the expressed desire for aid and cooperation in economic, social and political development in many countries;

Recognizing the moral imperatives binding especially upon people and nations with great resources;

Gratified that the U.S. Government and the United Nations have shown that they can effectively provide help to the less developed nations; and

Convinced that the interests of the peoples and nations of the world are inextricably intertwined, and that wholesome developments in any nation are beneficial to all peoples; the National Lutheran Council:

Expresses the judgment that increased governmental activities planned in long-range perspective which seek realistically to deal with problems of ignorance, poverty, ill health, and inequality of opportunity among the peoples of the world, would bring great benefits to all countries;

Believes it desirable that the United States continue to work for more adequate and effective assistance programs by the United Nations and its specialized agencies, coordinating its own programs with and channeling its resources through these agencies whenever this accomplishes their fundamental purposes more effectively;

Regards as commendable the efforts of the U.S. Government to encourage private enterprise, including investment capital, in the less developed areas, and its efforts to establish programs to protect the private investor against loss due to expropriation, war, and inconvertibility of currency;

Favors the continuation of a reciprocal trade agreements program;

Heartily endorses the U.S. Government's programs of international exchange of persons, which so effectively promote understanding among peoples and expresses the hope that the Government will continue these programs, together with regular substantial support of the exchange programs of the United Nations;

Believes that a comprehensive approach in projecting development programs is needed so that the emphasis on economic and social development in the light of legitimate political considerations is kept in balance and that military considerations are not unduly emphasized; and

Regards it desirable that the objectives of providing assistance to foreign nations be clearly stated in positive terms in the authorizing legislation so that the following purposes will be reflected:

(a) To promote the mutual security of nations;

(b) To foster wholesome economic, social and political development; and

(c) To express the concern of Americans for the well-being of other peoples.

Adopted by the National Lutheran Council, Atlantic City, N.J., February 4, 1960.

Research Triangle of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, we in North Carolina are proud of progress we are making in education, industry, and agriculture. We are proud, too, of the fact that more and more people in other areas of the United States, and indeed all over the world, are finding that North Carolina is an ideal place to work and live.

The big attraction today in the field of industrial development is research and brainpower. We in North Carolina have this, and more too, in areas of pleasant living that appeal to scholars as well as to machine operators.

Mr. William D. Snider, in his column in the September 7, 1961, edition of the Greensboro Daily News discusses the Research Triangle area of North Carolina and the potential it holds for our State and our area of the Nation.

In order for the Members of the Congress and the public to know more about the work we are doing and the plans we have for the future, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Snider's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEASANT PLACE

John Fischer, editor of Harper's, is a trifle late discovering North Carolina's Research Triangle, but we'll pardon his ignorance and commend his excellent advice for industry seekers.

In the "Editor's Easy Chair," Fischer expounds the theme of pleasant environment and great universities as enticing bait for today's "nice" industries:

"The exciting growth industries—electronics, for instance," he declares, "aren't interested in cheap labor. They need highly skilled men and are willing to pay almost any price to get them—as anyone can see by glancing at the help-wanted ads in 'Scientific American' or the Sunday New York Times. Neither are they much interested in low taxes, because low taxes mean poor schools. Such schools can't turn out the kind of brains these industries need; moreover, the men they seek aren't willing to settle in communities where their children will be doomed to a second-rate education."

But the new industry tycoons are terribly interested in the cultural, social and intellectual environment: "They like to live in a community of scholars—historians, writers, sociologists, even an occasional artist—and they enjoy being near good libraries, good orchestras, good art galleries. If you plunked them down in Spearfish, S.D., they would go out of their minds with boredom; no amount of money could persuade them to stay there."

And that brings up North Carolina's Research Triangle. It was founded for the very purpose Fischer emphasizes—to emulate the stunning success of the industrial complexes around Boston (MIT, Harvard, Boston University, Brandeis) and Southern California (Caltech, Stanford, University of California).

Both places, incidentally, also offer pleasant living areas—rolling hillsides, unspoiled countryside around Boston and good climate and rugged outdoors in southern California.

Fischer mentions North Carolina—in fact the very location of the research triangle—but then fails to name it:

"In North Carolina, for example, the area between Chapel Hill and Durham looks like a natural for such an enterprise. Both are pleasant towns. They are surrounded by unspoiled (well, all right, not hopelessly spoiled) countryside; it could be handsomely developed—at a profit—by public purchase and zoning. The Blue Ridge Mountains are an easy drive to the west, the Cape Hatteras Beach about the same distance east. In sum, a potential for the good life as promising as anything Massachusetts or California can offer."

"And here are two of the best educational institutions in the South: the University of North Carolina and Duke. Around this nucleus the State could—if it made a determined effort—build up a truly great intellectual center. It might become not just the best in its region, but one of the best in America. Inevitably it would give North Carolina the educational leadership of the South—and as a consequence, leadership in modern industry as well."

"It would cost money, of course. A doubling of teachers' salaries, new buildings, urban renewal, parks and landscaping, a long-range, well-thought-out regional plan: All of these would have to be financed somehow. (The big national foundations and the tobacco industry might both be eager to help.) But in the end the investment ought to pay off bountifully."

Agreed, John Fischer.

But fully three-fourths, perhaps more, of the job you mention has been done. The research triangle is a going concern. The Camille and Henry Dreyfus Foundation is building a \$2½ million polymer research facility; Chemstrand, a \$5½ million fiber research laboratory; and the research park shortly will have a \$300,000 administrative building. "Like Boston's Route 128," says the research park's executive vice president, James B. Shea, Jr., "only without manufacturing."

All this is only a beginning, but a good one. Governor Sanford has sponsored a statewide education program lifting teacher salaries by almost one-fourth. Urban renewal projects are underway in major Tar Heel cities. Statewide planning is a vital part of the Sanford administration.

Like the outdoor camper who asked us please not to ruin Cape Hatteras through too much publicity, we have a suspicion that the Chapel Hill-Durham region might be spoiled if too many big industrialists and research foundations discover its charms.

But thank you, John Fischer, for making your point emphatically: A pleasant place to live and a cultural environment will win more industrial dollars than all the shoddy come-ons of cheap labor and tax gimmicks.

Why Not Medical Care?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I would like to

place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the AFL-CIO News of September 9, 1961.

This editorial decries the lack of logic in the actions of a Congress which evidences its commitment to aiding the aged by generally increasing benefits and coverage under the social security laws, but stops short of substantive, specific aid in meeting the largest expenses of the aged—medical care.

As the editorial points out, Mr. Chairman, what the Congress has done so far is valuable, laudable, and commendatory. But valuable as it may be, it is not enough.

The editorial follows:

WHY NOT MEDICAL CARE?

The September social security checks delivered to millions of older citizens in the week beginning Labor Day reflect for the first time the increases in various benefits voted at the current session of Congress.

The changes in eligibility and other provisions have also resulted in nearly three-quarters of a million new applications for benefits by persons previously outside the scope of the law or drawing very limited benefits.

The millions drawing higher benefits and those drawing benefits for the first time must be somewhat mystified by the logic of lawmakers who are willing without so much as a murmur to provide broader benefits and badly needed increases but express grave doubts about simple legislative proposals to help these same social security beneficiaries, on sharply limited budgets, meet the increasing cost of medical care.

There is little doubt that the extra dollars in the new benefit checks will be used in many cases to help pay medical care bills. Perhaps that's why the American Medical Association did not launch a violent campaign of opposition to the social security increases.

But increasing benefits a few dollars every few years does not meet the major medical care problem confronting our older citizens. If anything, it accentuates the problem and the need, a need that can only be fulfilled by providing medical care for the aged under the social security system.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the August issue of American Heritage magazine, Bruce Catton points up eloquently the importance of the Civil War Centennial. He regards the observance as a time for contemplation of the fact that freedom is a magnificent possession and an undying responsibility.

The article was called to my attention by Rev. William S. Warford, of Quincy, Ill., chairman of the Quincy Civil War Centennial Commission. It deserves the attention of all thoughtful Americans.

Here is the text:

LEST WE FORGET

(By Bruce Catton)

If the tone for the entire centennial period is to be set by parades, sham battles, and

a general recreation of a swords-and-roses atmosphere designed to amuse the tourist and slake our thirst for romance, we are simply going to stultify ourselves. When we show Americans firing on the American flag and doing their best to destroy the American Government, let us at least do it because we finally learned something from those desperate endeavors and not simply because it makes an amusing spectacle. Few people, to be sure, are entirely immune to the appeal of a spectacle; human nature being what it is, most of us have had moments in which we wish, illogically, that we might just have had a glimpse at some of those struggles which, now that they are suitably remote in time, are seen through a romantic haze. But we do need to be very clear about what it is that we are trying to do.

Precisely what—to begin with—do we think we are commemorating? When we undertake to recreate, these vignettes from the past, how do we make our selection? There are some events that do not quite lend themselves to proper staging. Will we, for example, reenact the starving of the first prisoner of war? Should the New York draft riots be reenacted? Or Sherman's march to the sea, the devastation of the Shenandoah Valley, or even the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, with the accompanying hangings?

No doubt we shall draw the line somewhere, because the point of these reenactments is entertainment, and there were things in the Civil War which, even a century later, just are not very entertaining to contemplate. But that is precisely where the trouble lies. We are in serious danger of taking the most significant anniversary in American history and using it as a means of giving ourselves a bright and colorful holiday. How the Civil War soldier fought his battles is no doubt worth examining, but infinitely more important is a consideration of why he fought and what he accomplished. Lay on the sentiment, the romance, and the dramatic appeal heavily enough, and we shall presently forget that the war was fought by real living men who were deeply moved by thoughts and emotions of overwhelming urgency. To lose sight of the cause that was fought for and the dedication with which it was served is to dishonor the sacrifice, for victor and for vanquished alike.

The centennial does demand our remembrance, but the act of remembrance demands something of us.

It calls first of all for an attitude, a frame of mind, a brooding awareness of the immensity of the tragedy that once befell our country and an honest attempt to understand the far-reaching results which grew out of that tragedy. It calls upon us to be fully adult in our approach to it, so that we can make ourselves familiar with the hot passions and the human blindnesses that led up to it and grew out of it and can realize that greatness went hand in hand with meanness, that men caught up in a tide too strong for them to resist did somehow accomplish more than they meant to accomplish, that the whole of the terrible process did in the end mean more than the sum of its parts. We need to realize that although we are never going to reach a complete understanding of the war, it is not wholly incomprehensible; that it was infinitely more than a needless catastrophe, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

All of this has little to do with parades, reenactments, and the serving of refreshments by bright young women in hoop-skirts and ruffles. It has to do with the real value of the centennial; with the unfinished business which the Civil War left to us, the living. What we are today grows directly out of that war; what we mean when we are at our best is rooted in it. It left us not just something to remember but something to

live up to. It began a process that still is not finished and that will be our continuing responsibility as long as we live.

"For in its blind, brutal, and all but unendurably expensive way, the Civil War did accomplish something."

It created one nation, destined for world leadership, and it once and forever expanded the dimensions of American freedom. It brought Negro slavery to an end; doing that, it left us with no conceivable alternative to the task of creating, perfecting, and defending a one-class citizenship in our fair land. The fact that this task is a long way from being finished is beside the point. The commitment was made for us, and we cannot either escape it or forget it. Under everything else—the remembrance of the valiant things done by men long dead, the bright pathos of the Lost Cause, the continuing endeavor to heal the deep wounds which the war inflicted—this is implicit in the Civil War centennial. The centennial years are hardly less solemn than the years they commemorate.

We have had reenactments, parades, and flowery speeches, and we shall doubtless have more. They are all to the good, so long as they are not all that we see or hear or think about. But we shall lose something we must not lose if we make these centennial years simply a time of soft and forgetful sentiment; if we hesitate to stress the final meaning of the war because we are afraid to "stir up controversy" or touch some present-day issue which might leave thorns in our fingers. We are a grownup people by now, or at least we think we are, and we do not need to go through this anniversary on tiptoe.

Somewhere in these centennial observances there must be a time for sober reflection; for contemplation of the fact that freedom is a magnificent possession and an undying responsibility; for rededication to the ideal that came to its first flowering in battle smoke and agony. The centennial is not to be approached lightly. It means either nothing at all—or everything.

Good Family Discipline and Good Family Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Mr. Dick D. Heller, Jr., editor of the Decatur Daily Democrat, recently wrote an editorial entitled "For Parents Only." Because this editorial speaks so well for all of us, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR PARENTS ONLY

The touchy world situation has led a number of families to reevaluate their own way of living.

Many of us seldom think about the changes that would be necessary if we were engaged in another world conflict. But perhaps we should.

Two things will be absolutely essential—good family discipline and good family health.

Now, it will be too late to start thinking of these things when war is declared, or an invasion of the United States starts, or a

bad storm leaves the entire family terrified. Right now, this very minute, you can prepare for such things—but when they happen, it will be too late if you have not prepared in advance.

Good family discipline, obedience to parents, is rapidly disappearing from American family life. It is understandable. Families are so busy indulging in the individual pleasures of each member that they have no time to think of themselves as a family, getting along together, growing together.

But what will happen when the first bomb falls, the first invader comes to Decatur, or a tornado wipes out the town?

Will your family respond to the central discipline of the father and mother, then oldest son, and so on? Or will they break up, terrified, into worthless individuals, each fighting, clawing, and losing his fight for existence?

Our President has asked each of us to get in physical, mental and moral shape to win the war, declared or undeclared, against Godless communism.

This means many things to the family. Dads and moms have to keep themselves in physical shape, and be well enough instructed in emergencies to know what to do for themselves and their families.

It means that grade school and high school children should be encouraged to walk and ride their bikes, rather than drive to school.

Athletics should be encouraged, as well as good eating habits, and good family discipline.

Family worship should be strengthened. The time may well be coming when a strong personal faith, and immediate, unquestioning obedience to parents, and those in charge, will be absolutely necessary for survival.

Clarifying the Reemployment Rights of Certain Persons Entering the Armed Forces

SPEECH
OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman will take a minute or two to explain this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to explain the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the existing reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to clarify and remove any doubts that might arise with regard to the reemployment protection to be accorded certain persons who leave their jobs to enter the Armed Forces in the interest of national defense.

In the month of August this year the Congress passed a law giving the President the power to extend the period of service of persons on active duty and the power to call individuals and Reserve organizations to active duty without their consent. The purpose of this bill is to extend the reemployment rights for the same period of time it is possible to extend involuntarily the period of service or to extend those reemployment rights for the same period that a person volun-

teers for active service, provided that additional service is no greater than that to which he could have been involuntarily called.

If America Has Muscles Left, Time To Flex 'Em Has Arrived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the conduct of the so-called unaligned nations at the recent Belgrade conference has shocked the American people. Even those who were so optimistic as to think that Communist Yugoslavia and the self-styled neutrals were aligned on the side of the United States have now come to the realization that the billions of dollars we have spent overseas have not bought us friends.

The Shelby Daily Star, published at Shelby, N.C., had a very fine editorial on September 13, 1961, with reference to the fiasco at Belgrade. I believe my colleagues will find the Star editorial to be most interesting, and I request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

IF AMERICA HAS MUSCLES LEFT, TIME TO FLEX 'EM HAS ARRIVED

The failure of our foreign policy of the last 15 years was so plainly spelled out in Belgrade that even free thinkers in the new State Department could hardly miss the message.

As charted in the current issue of U.S. News and World Report, the 24 so-called nonaligned nations between the end of World War II and March 31, 1961, had received a total of \$6,051,000,000 from the United States in economic, technical and military aid.

In case figures bore you, that's over \$6 billion.

What did we purchase? A slap in the face from the 24 nations, who shivered before Khrushchev's exploding nuclear bombs and came out with a weak-kneed plea for the Russian leader and President Kennedy to talk it out.

During the conference, Yugoslavia's Dictator Tito commented that U.S. aid to his Communist nation should have been twice as much. This Communist nation, incidentally, led the list of all 24 by receiving two billion, 81 million dollars in the period mentioned above.

Yes, Tito, led the so-called neutrals in naming the western allies for criticism in the current world crisis while the Communist bloc was not even given a slap on the wrist.

The opinion will be immediately voiced, "You can't buy friends." That's true, but it's no reason to establish a policy of fattening the enemy or toadying to nations whose leaders are too gutless to take a stand on freedom's side.

Our policy has been to play down our military potential, to never speak in anger to the uncommitted nations and to make almost unlimited funds available from the coffers of the U.S. Treasury.

This policy has not produced friendship, but more important it has not produced respect from these nations who wobble between Moscow and Washington.

Who appointed Tito as chairman on the nonaligned? Who gave India's Nehru license to peddle his spineless philosophy on his knees before Khrushchev?

One positive result must come from Belgrade. The leaders represented there do not deserve the deference they have received from the United States.

While we polished the apple and oiled the palm of one so-called neutral leader after another, Russia adopted an opinion-betrayed policy of Muscovite muscle.

This obviously produced results, because the predicted propaganda victory for the United States when Russia announced resumption of tests faded to nothing in the mute cowardice displayed at Belgrade by leaders of nations which are free because America made them that way.

It is high time for America to withdraw the money and extend the muscle. No longer can we hope to gain anything by utopian schemes to transform the world by walking on tiptoe with a bag of goodies.

From now on we must adopt a policy that there is no such thing as a neutral nation. We must recognize our friends, resist our enemies and studiously ignore those we cannot identify as either.

That's a policy the world will understand. And respect.

The South Carolina Student Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, by an act of our State legislature in 1957, the South Carolina State Student Legislature came into being. This legislature is composed entirely of students from the various college campuses in our State. This student legislative body functions exactly the same as any other legislature. Each campus elects congressmen and senators to represent it at annual sessions in our State capital, Columbia. Also elected are a governor, a lieutenant governor, a secretary of state, and an attorney general. Committees are formed, and other officials are appointed by the governor including a treasurer, a press secretary, and so forth. The procedure observed in conducting business is the same as that of our regular legislative process.

The governor is the official spokesman for the student legislature. The present governor, Mr. William L. Schachte, Jr., is a student at Clemson College in my congressional district. Mr. Schachte is doing an outstanding job in bringing to the attention of South Carolinians and citizens of the Nation as a whole the importance of their program. His able lieutenant governor, F. Glenn Smith, of Charleston, has also contributed much to the success of this body.

Mr. Speaker, the honor and pleasure of addressing this worthwhile organization was afforded me last year. Thus I can say, firsthand, that the South Carolina State Student Legislature is the finest of its kind and the most beneficial student organization I have seen—from the standpoints both of the students directly involved and the other citizens of our

State. Not only does this organization constitute a practical educational experience for these young people, but it also serves in an advisory capacity to our own South Carolina State Legislature in that almost all bills passed by this student body have been enacted verbatim by the State Legislature. These students seriously and conscientiously accept responsibility and respond with unbelievable results. They are aware that the world is not going to wait on them, that both foreign and domestic problems are more complex than ever before, and that they must be prepared and willing to meet the challenge now.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly recommend that all States join South Carolina in adopting a similar student legislature. We are extremely proud of our young people and the fact that they have proved they can accept responsibility. Therefore, I join my distinguished colleague from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] in introducing the following concurrent resolution today:

Whereas the South Carolina State Student Legislature was created by State statute in 1957; and

Whereas all colleges and universities in the State of South Carolina are afforded an opportunity to participate in the South Carolina State Student Legislature and most do so participate; and

Whereas the purpose of the South Carolina State Student Legislature is to provide an opportunity to learn the fundamentals of government by duplicating all functions of the State government; and

Whereas the State Legislature of South Carolina has been impressed by the legislative actions of the South Carolina State Student Legislature since its inception: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress extends its congratulations to the South Carolina State Student Legislature and expresses its belief that this type of organization provides an excellent method for combining theoretical knowledge and practical experience in teaching the fundamentals of democratic government, and is one which could well be adopted by all States.

Polish-German Relations and the Polish-German Boundary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 22d anniversary of the outbreak of the Second World War, the council of the Polish societies and clubs of the Delaware chapter of the Polish-American Congress issued a bulletin which included a sampling of the opinions expressed in free world Polish journals and magazines.

Since the views expressed in the bulletin may be of interest to my colleagues, I include the text here as part of my remarks:

[From Polish Affairs, London, May 1961]

THE PROBLEM OF THE POLISH-GERMAN FRONTIER

Recent development in Central and Eastern Europe have stressed, once again, the paramount importance of a decision by the Western Powers, which would confirm the Polish German frontier. We give below the text of a memorandum of the executive committee of the Polish Council of National Unity, which sets this problem in a wider perspective:

"European unity in the shape of a political union or confederation of states as one of the pillars of a wider Atlantic Community is the one shining beacon of hope for the oppressed peoples of Europe, for the white race and indeed for the whole Western civilization. Substantial progress toward achieving this goal was made since the Second World War, to a large extent thanks to the generous and farsighted help of the United States of America. The Coal and Steel Community, the Euratom and more recently the Common Market were established by six continental European states. These agreements are likely to be extended soon to more Western European countries. At the root of this progress lies the newly established Franco-German understanding. The possession of Alsace-Lorraine by France is no longer questioned by Germany, and the city of Strasbourg has been chosen by common agreement as the first seat of a European political institution.

"The prestige of Europe has grown considerably together with its prosperity in consequence of well devised and well executed steps on the road leading to unity. A picture gradually emerges of the future shape of Europe: a free society, multilingual, multidominational, democratic, firmly link to America by ties of kinship and common interest in many domains including that of security. To the appressed peoples of Europe the emergence of such a society symbolizes their hope of ultimate deliverance.

"Whatever the progress achieved so far, however, the future of Europe is by no means secure yet. The emerging structure is exposed to blast from the outside world and to tremors from within.

"Their causes are multiple. Among them most dangerous is militant nationalism still the greatest force in contemporary human society appealing to our noblest sentiments but also to the most brutal instincts of human nature. This is what befell Germany at the time of the Third Reich. The cry for frontier revision at the expense of Poland had never stopped in Germany in the inter-war period. It undoubtedly favored the advent of Nazism. Today it threatens the unity of Europe. It is no doubt in awareness of this serious danger that President De Gaulle recently gave his views on the permanence of the present German-Polish frontier. His statement conveyed the following warning to the German people: France is ready to join hands with Germany in the cultivation of a common European garden. But only on condition that Germany will give up quarrels and feuds as to the garden's boundaries. Europe cannot be expected to espouse Teutonic national feuds.

"De Gaulle's statement was that of a friend. It may have caused some heart-burning in Bonn, but it can only help to clarify the situation and in the long run make the task of the German Government easier. However, the De Gaulle statement has not, up to the present moment, found corroboration in Washington and London.

"Meanwhile, there is more than one reason why events should not be allowed to drift. The German Federal Republic has in fact to choose between a constructive collaboration with her Western neighbors, the goal of

which is European unity as a prerequisite of peace, and the pursuit of narrow nationalistic aims. The latter policy would inevitably ruin the chances of a European unification. It would increase the danger of war. It would, moreover, bring the Federal German Republic within the orbit of Russian hegemony. There is evidence to show that the Adenauer government is aware of this dilemma and that it shrinks from the pursuit of a Bismarckian policy which might have exerted an irresistible attraction in the 19th century at a period of unrestrained competition among European national states but which today is fraught with great danger. But it is subjected to mounting pressure from within, particularly at the time of elections. Besides, the Bonn Government can hardly be expected to show prudence and restraint beyond the advice of its NATO partners.

"Let us now in turn look at the vital European stage with the eyes of Germany's eastern neighbors: the Poles and the Czechs. These nations belong to the European family on geographical, historical, and cultural grounds. Their participation in a future European organization, together with that of the other now subjugated countries of Europe, would be of advantage to all concerned and contribute to Europe's political equilibrium and economic strength. In present circumstances they cannot apply for membership either in the existing European institutions or in any all-European organization. However, as soon as this becomes possible they are sure to be no less eager than the citizens of what is today the German Democratic Republic to join the European circle. But only on condition that their territorial integrity is not called into question.

"Thus the final sanctioning of the Polish-German frontier and the respect of the Czechoslovak-German frontier is one of the essential prerequisites for the setting up of a united Europe and the peaceful unification of Germany. Much will depend on the line taken by the German Federal Republic, one of the main potential beneficiaries of a successful European settlement, on the moderation and clearness of vision of the Federal Government. But surely the moment has now come for the great democracies to speak plainly so as to clarify a situation, the confusion of which can serve but the interest of those who seek to promote discord."

[From the Polish American Congress,
Chicago, Ill.]

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Adopted by executive officers and the board of directors of the Polish American Congress at the meeting held in Chicago April 14, 1961.

We note with growing apprehension that the Government of the Federal German Republic is allotting increasingly larger sums of money to irredentist organizations whose sole purpose is to create revisionistic, anti-Polish turmoil and propaganda in Western Europe and in United States.

It is our considered opinion, based on many authorities on international law, French, English, American, and even German, that the cession of the territories east of the Oder-Neisse Rivers to Poland at the time of peace preliminaries at Potsdam, is a historic and accomplished fact which cannot be reversed, except by a new war.

The permanency of this cession rests in the fact, that the Allied Powers ordered removal of German population from the territories in question.

No responsible statesman would even contemplate summary removal of several million people from one country to another if he did not have in mind permanent solution of the Polish-German boundary line.

There are no more Germans in Polish Western territories and one-third of its present population of nearly 8 million, has already been born there of Polish parents.

In view of these facts, German renewal of revisionist propaganda can be regarded as too obvious an effort to intimidate the Polish Nation and force it to unwanted dependence on the Soviet Union, as the sole guarantor of the Oder-Neisse boundary.

To bring this needless and at the same time dangerous friction to an end, it is necessary for the Western Powers to recognize the Oder-Neisse line as the final boundary between Germany and Poland.

All that is needed is an acknowledgement of the jure of the situation which has already been in existence de facto for the past 16 years.

[From the Mysl Polska, London]

CRISIS REACHES DEEPER

The editorial of "The Polish Thought," published in the Polish language in London put forward a thesis, that, considering the recent setbacks in the Western World and the nature of the Russian pronouncement on the Berlin question, the Soviet Union is ready for a political move, no matter what the risk connected with it. "Polish Thought" continues:

"Such a move will have, undoubtedly, far-reaching consequences. No matter what the Western countries will do, this will put the German problem on the precarious balance. If they will preserve their present standing to uphold their rights in the western Berlin and nonrecognition of the German Democratic Republic, this will open a wide field for conflicts with the administration of this Republic about the access to the city. This tension will grow more serious, considering, that the Democratic Republic is an alliance with the Soviet Union and that the Red Army will continue to stay on the Elbe River.

If, however, by threatening with war, Moscow is able to push the Western Powers out of Berlin and to consolidate the Soviet rule up to the Elbe, this will not remain without any influence on the attitude and policy of the German Federal Republic and will weigh clearly over the future of NATO.

It appears, that any outcome of this situation, even in the form of the most ingenious compromise in the Berlin problem, will not change the fact, that the time for the solution of the German question is near, without which the establishment of peace in Europe is extremely difficult.

Western Powers, if they do not want to be defeated over this question, should have a clear plan for its solution and a firm policy aiming at it. The nature of the German problem in the light of the German revisionist policy and Soviet attempt at hegemony, is of that kind, that it cannot be solved otherwise but in the framework of a wider reconstruction of Europe. The map of the postwar Germany must remain the basis of this reconstruction, the result of the Second World War and a main guarantee against the regeneration of the German eastern policy, always being the first step for attempts at the domination of Europe. The second condition is the liberation of Poland from the Russian supremacy.

In spite of the fact that this is really a central problem, nothing positive was done up to now for the solution of this important European question, and this is: strong and free Poland separating Germany and Soviet Russia. Poland which for 150 years of her enslavement—writes Der Europäische Sten—"showed such a deep love for her native land, since 15 years has resisted with courage the Soviet penetration. If the Polish nation did not present this resistance against Soviet influence, the nations of the Western Europe would not be able to defend their freedom."

We are quoting this voice of the German monthly as an example, how, even in the

German eyes, is regarded the Polish problem, when looked upon from the standpoint of security and freedom of Western Europe. Although this voice is at odds with the German revisionist tendencies, it does not fail to be an expression of obvious truth, forced upon everyone, who seriously thinks about the future of Europe and searches for the elements of her stable construction.

The developing Berlin crisis brings this problem indirectly upon the agenda of the Western policy. As it is getting deeper, its consequences growing, and—finally—in relation to the problem of disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union, which Khrushchev called in his Moscow speech as "the most important world problem," which obviously cannot be solved by mechanical limitation of armaments without strengthening security and without political balance on our continent—the problem of the reconstruction of Europe will become more pressing and more understandable for the world.

One should hope, that the logic of facts, and that of the political situation will break the low spirit of the leaders of the countries and the ignorance of the public opinion. It will direct the destiny of the policy of the West on the proper road in searching for stability and permanent security of Europe."

AGREEMENT BETWEEN POLAND AND GERMANY IS POSSIBLE

Orzel Bialy, published in England, discusses the tactical and real agreements between nations and concludes that some vague attempts of the Bonn Government on establishing fragmentary diplomatic relations with Poland belong to the former kind. Orzel Bialy writes:

"Accepting two premises: (1) That the Polish-German agreement would remove from the heart of Europe a very dangerous and flammable spot, which forces striving for violent revolutions can use as a starting point for setting up a universal fire, as this happened in the last war; (2) that both nations—not only Polish but German as well, as it was already clearly proved—in the final analysis, the results of the existing between them flammable situation must write off as losses.

"We can state, without any doubt, that the agreement between the two nations lies both in the interest of themselves and the whole world. Moreover, in the name of such an agreement the obliteration of the memory of the past could be attempted, which, however would not mean that its lesson was forgotten or the necessary prudence neglected.

"But, relating to the above, only a real agreement can be desired, which can yield permanent fruits. Tactical agreement is useless as being unsincere and lasting only up to that moment, when one side—in this case German side—could in the favorable situation turn it down as an unnecessary mask."

Orzel Bialy further continues:

"Therefore when we deal with the possibility of the Polish-German agreement—and many reasons looked for it—we have, first of all, to ask: And what is about German recognition of the Polish western boundary? And here, the history of the German policy, as in the period between world wars, repeats itself with a frightening accuracy, possibly, being even more distinct now. We say more distinct. And this is really so. Germany is closer to the West after the Second World War than between the two wars, but at the same time they emphasize more emphatically revisionist aims in the East. Differentiation between their relations toward the eastern and western frontiers, which Germany presented in Locarno, looks quite innocently by comparison what we see today. In addition, from a certain time, the revisionist policy of the Bonn Government grew stronger. The members of the government do not hes-

itate to deliver revisionist speeches. They stopped also to use the cover that their aim is only to revise the Polish-German boundary and claims are pronounced going even further than the German possessions in 1937. Recently large funds were given to the German refugee organizations for the propaganda of the German revisionist demands abroad, mainly in the United States.

"We have therefore to state: The policy of the Bonn Government in relation to Poland is exactly the same as it was in the interwar period. We know how this policy ended. Assurance, that Germany would not use force, means as much as the previous assurances. Germany knows very well that they cannot use force today. Assurance, that one will not hit somebody while his hands are bound and when the attempted assault would be of the worst consequences for the offender, does not cost a lot. This only gives a testimony of what kind of nonchalant attitude Germans have not only for Poles but toward foreign diplomacy as well, if they think that this assurance can be taken seriously as basis for trust.

"Polish German agreement? Obviously yes, the most emphatic, yes, however not the tactical agreement which masks other purposes and which serves for a kind of chloroform before the operation, but a real agreement which could be an aim in itself. What matters is the real and permanent and not only a verbal change of the German policy toward Poland. The test case is the recognition of the boundary."

The Blackburn Plan: A Lesson in Self-Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a very interesting article about Blackburn College, which was distributed as a U.S. Information Service feature.

Blackburn College is unique in that it has a self-help program, which has worked successfully for nearly a half century.

Blackburn is located in my hometown of Carlinville. This institution has produced many students who have attained high positions in society.

The article is as follows:

THE BLACKBURN PLAN—A LESSON IN SELF-HELP

In the low, flat farm country of southern Illinois, some 40 miles from the State Capital of Springfield, nearly 400 students live and work and study in the dozen buildings that make up the campus of Blackburn College in the town of Carlinville. They come from cities and farms, from the east coast and the Western States, from all over the world.

At first glance, Blackburn seems typical of many small colleges in America. Handsome new buildings stand near those wearing the patina of time, and a good, basic liberal arts education is the goal of every student. Yet Blackburn is unique.

It was built, brick on brick, by the students themselves.

In what has become known to educators as the Blackburn plan, students are expected to work their way through Blackburn

in a partnership with each other and with the college. Every student devotes 15 hours a week of labor.

They construct the buildings, install plumbing and electrical wiring and pour the cement for the sidewalks. They paint the walls and keep those walls scrubbed clean. They do the laundry and landscape the campus ground. Some of them serve as secretaries, librarians or faculty assistants. Corn and other foodstuffs at Blackburn are raised by students, and students cook, serve the meals in the college dining room, and clean up afterward.

Graduates come back to Blackburn today and point with pride to the wall of a dormitory or classroom building and claim, "That's my wall. I laid those bricks."

Many American college students take part-time jobs to earn part of their expenses, and at a few colleges classes are alternated with work experience. The Blackburn approach is to help students work their way through college and to keep operating costs at a minimum by utilizing student labor. This unique work plan was born of economic necessity 48 years ago.

Blackburn College had been founded by a Presbyterian minister and chartered in 1857. It continued as a very small, liberal arts college, open to those of any religious denomination but largely local in its influence, until 1912. That year marked the beginning of Dr. William M. Hudson's 33-year-tenure as president of the college and of Blackburn's phenomenal growth.

There were only 35 students at the end of that year and the school was in great financial difficulty. In one of his imaginative innovations to save the school, Dr. Hudson started the work plan as an aid to bright students who otherwise could not afford to attend college.

This brought more students, and it also brought more financial bequests. Many men who had been too poor to finance a college education for themselves were eager to share the wealth of their own success with a college dedicated to helping the needy and with students willing to work their way to an education.

The work plan was so successful that it became the distinctive mark of the college and one which shows no signs of being abandoned. In this day of spiraling education costs, Blackburn officials are proud that they are able to keep tuition comparatively low by means of the work plan. Parents, trying to finance college educations for their children, welcome the plan. And the students discover a new dimension to college education.

For the spirit at Blackburn is like that of a family whose members work together to build and keep their own home. All students cooperate in a dynamic community effort, sharing the joy of production and the pride of achievement.

There are no social walls, although today's students come from all kinds of homes, rich as well as poor. No sororities or fraternities build a favored class, and working bears no stigma because everyone works. Campus heroes are not the football players or the socially poised, but those who best discharge their responsibilities to the college community.

In addition to the faculty, there are only nine professionals on the Blackburn staff to do all the work of building and maintaining a college. The rest is done by students.

The work plan is directed through a "work committee." This is made up of two or three faculty advisers, two student work managers—one for men and one for women—and eight student "work heads." Each work head is in charge of tasks to be done in one of eight areas: kitchen, dining room, laundry, heating plant, student center, construction, and men's and women's janitor service.

The student work heads and managers must ensure that students fulfill their work schedules and obtain substitutes if they are ill or absent. They also are responsible for maintaining a high quality of performance, and three times a year must grade students who work in their areas.

Members of the work committee are chosen each spring by a competitive system of tests and tryouts. Before the opening of school in the autumn, every Blackburn student makes three choices of jobs to which he would like to be assigned. The committee then has the gigantic task of matching nearly 400 students to jobs.

Consideration is given first to academic schedules, then to previous work experience and student preference. If a student finds later that his job interferes with studying or is one for which he is not qualified, he may request a change.

But few adjustments are needed. Most students discover great satisfaction in working together, learning new skills and uncovering latent abilities as well as the true meaning of the dignity of labor. They gain a self-reliance and a sense of real values that are priceless.

Although Blackburn is known best for its work plan, it maintains a balance of study-work-play for its students. Many recreational and extracurricular activities are offered but the greatest emphasis is on scholarship.

The college is fully accredited and its students score high in nationwide college examinations. A bachelor of arts degree is given in 10 different areas of the humanities, the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the college offers preprofessional training in law, medicine, religion and education. Approximately 8 percent of its graduates enter the professions or enroll in universities for graduate study.

In its academic program and much of its social program Blackburn is comparable to similar colleges, but in the eyes of students and faculty alike the work plan enriches the students' whole educational experience.

Blackburn gives a liberal education in personal responsibility and community effort that trains hands in skill, reveals executive ability, and stresses the spiritual value of shared work. This way of learning is a way of life, and it is based on the philosophy that "What's worth having is worth working for."

Pesticides Are Good Friends, but Can Be Dangerous Enemies if Used by Zealots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I introduce into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of September 2, 1961. The editorial is a warning of clear and present danger in the overuse, or careless use, of pesticides.

The editorial tells of the death of millions of birds, fish, and small game directly traceable to the use of chemicals designed to eliminate harm done by insect pests. It also lauds the establishment of the Government's new Federal Pest Control Review Board, created by

the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

I strongly hope that this new agency will do much to make the advancements achieved by modern science in control of insect pests less of a mixed blessing than they now are.

The article follows:

PESTICIDES ARE GOOD FRIENDS, BUT CAN BE DANGEROUS ENEMIES IF USED BY ZEALOTS

Although chemical sprays for trees and crops have been essential to agriculture for more than two generations, the indiscriminate use of certain insecticides in recent years is disturbing. Today there are hundreds of powerful preparations on the market which too often are scattered broadcast by airplane in vast quantities and without due care.

One of the workhorses of the insecticide group is DDT, which does a remarkable job in killing off bugs and worms. It also kills birds, fish, and small game. Some chemists are wondering out loud whether the stuff really is as harmless to the human system as claimed, and the Federal Government will not allow milk to be shipped interstate if it shows any trace of DDT. Tests have shown that once DDT is ingested into the human body, it never leaves. It is indestructible.

A special study done on the Michigan State University campus at East Lansing, by Dr. George J. Wallace, professor of zoology, was revealing. In an area that had about 370 robins in 1954, only 15 could be found in 1957, after 3 years of intensive spraying for elm bark beetles and mosquitoes. Hundreds of dying robins, jerking and trembling, were brought to Dr. Walter Nickell, at the Cranbrook Institute of Science, Bloomfield Hills, Mich., but he was unable to save a single bird. The robins had ingested the poison when they ate earthworms, which had picked it up from decayed leaves that had fallen from the sprayed trees.

Robins are not the only birds to suffer from the sprays. Bluebirds have been decimated in many places. Chickadees, warblers, nuthatches, woodpeckers, titmice, blue jays, thrashers, grackles, flickers, and other varieties have suffered alarming declines in numbers.

Perhaps one of the worst examples of misused insecticides can be seen in Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana, where a massive extermination program is being carried out against the fire ant. The fire ant is undoubtedly a miserable pest to have around, but it is doubtful that the program justifies the slaughter or millions of birds, fish, and small game.

For all these reasons it is encouraging that the Federal Government is setting up a special Pesticides Coordinating Committee to look into the whole matter. One of the group's first tasks will be a close look at the operation of the fire ant program.

The sad thing about all this is that the new chemicals, properly used, are a tremendous boon to the farmer. Without them our bountiful agricultural plant would be 25 years behind the times. But there is no doubt that these new pesticides are not meant to be broadcast from the air willy-nilly on every hamlet that is bothered with mosquitoes.

According to the not exactly complacent Dr. Wallace, "the current widespread and ever-expanding pesticide program poses the greatest threat that animal life in North America has ever faced—worse than deforestation, worse than market hunting, and illegal shooting, worse than drainage, drought or oil pollution, and possibly worse than all of these decimating factors combined." If the programs are not curbed, he

adds, "we shall have been witnesses, within a single decade, to a greater extermination of animal life than has occurred in all the previous years of man's history on earth."

Genesis of the World's Greatest Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clifford D. Owsley, a resident of Arlington in my Virginia congressional district, has presented to me a copy of an original study he has completed on the role played by a letter of invitation in shaping the great Gettysburg Address delivered by our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Owsley is a writer with the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, heading a branch of Special Reports, Press and Writing. He has been a newspaper reporter, editor, and columnist and has acted as writing consultant to the Air Adjutant General and editorial director, Publishing Division, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force. He is a graduate of Emory University and has done graduate work at George Washington University and American University.

I have been both fascinated and impressed by Mr. Owsley's study, and believe my congressional colleagues will enjoy the opportunity to share it with me. I therefore under unanimous consent insert the article in full in this RECORD.

GENESIS OF THE WORLD'S GREATEST SPEECH (By Cliff Owsley)

Four score and 18 years ago a prominent lawyer in Gettysburg, Pa., wrote a letter inviting a man in Washington to make "a few appropriate remarks" at the dedication of a cemetery. Most interesting and revealing is a comparison of that invitation with the famous speech it brought forth, the Gettysburg Address.

David Wills, the lawyer who wrote the letter, is surely due credit for helping shape one of the world's greatest speeches, perhaps the greatest. Could we say that Mr. Wills planted the seeds? Perhaps that would be giving him too much credit, since a seed contains the basic elements of that which develops from it. Obviously the speech contains elements not found in the letter; beyond question, the plant which took shape and flourished was the product of Abraham Lincoln's high talents and deep convictions. But from a close comparison of the two documents, it is also clear that the letter was the starting point of the speech and a liberal source of ideas for it.

It's true too, that the comparison is nearly all in Lincoln's favor. Yet, when this is conceded, the conclusion is inescapable that David Wills' influence on the speech is little short of amazing. If he didn't plant the seeds, he prepared the seedbed. He prodded the soil of greatness, causing it to bestir, making the seeds that were there germinate and grow into the noblest flower of human expression.

A germ of the central theme is there in the letter; so are several of the ideas and some of the key words that showed up in the speech. In fact, practically everything in the

letter served as raw material for the address. The significance, though, is in what Lincoln did with the raw material. For here we find the prime example of his uncanny ability to take an ordinary thought and clothe it in extraordinary language; to enlarge and enoble an idea and express it in immortal words.

This great talent of Lincoln's amounted to genius. Throughout his life the ideas he dealt with were not new, but when he finished with them they were in shining words fit for the ages. Few, if any, men have possessed that talent in the degree that Lincoln did; none have excelled him at it.

Observe the letter and speech:

"TO HIS EXCELLENCY, A. Lincoln

President of the United States:

"Sir: The several States having soldiers in the Army of the Potomac, who were killed at the battle of Gettysburg, or have since died at the various hospitals which were established in the vicinity, have procured grounds on a prominent part of the battlefield, for a cemetery, and are having the dead removed to them and properly buried.

"These grounds will be consecrated and set apart to this sacred purpose, by appropriate ceremonies on Thursday, November 19. Hon. Edward Everett will deliver the oration.

"I am authorized by the Governors of the different States to invite you to be present, and participate in these ceremonies, which will doubtless be very imposing and solemnly impressive.

"It is the desire, that after the oration you, as Chief Executive of the Nation, formally set apart these grounds to their sacred use by a few appropriate remarks.

"It will be a source of great gratification to the many widows and orphans that have been made almost friendless by the great battle here, to have you here personally, and it will kindle anew in the breasts of the comrades of these brave dead, who are now in the tented field, or nobly meeting the foe at the front, a confidence that they who sleep in death on the battlefield, are not forgotten by those highest in authority, and they will feel that, should their fate be the same, their remains will not be uncared for.

"We hope you will be able to be present and perform this last, but solemn act to the soldier dead on this battlefield. I am, with great respect, your Excellency's obedient servant,

"DAVID WILLS, Agent,

"A. G. CURTIN,

"Governor of Pennsylvania, and acting for all the States."

"THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war; testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

"But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve

that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Three areas in the comparison are worth examining. First but least important is the curious fact that the invitation and the speech are exactly the same length, each containing 272 words.¹ Second, certain words and phrases in the letter carry ideas that Lincoln used but extended in scope while compressing them into his own inimitable style. Third and most important is the theme of the speech, dedication, suggested by Wills and magnificently enlarged upon by Lincoln.

The fact that the invitation and speech are the same length is an interesting curiosity. Its significance, if any, may be in noting that Lincoln could make a speech, and a very great one, with the same number of words it took to invite him to make it. But who at this point, knowing its end result, would say that David Wills' letter should have been shorter? After all, it served its purpose superbly.

Now to our second area of comparison: words and ideas from the letter that were converted into the address. While most of the letter in one form or another is to be found in the speech, it was truly transformed by the magic of Lincoln's touch. In passing through the mill of that superior mind it came out far different, far nobler, and distinctly Lincoln's. Each idea is either changed in some way, compressed into fewer and simpler words, or broadened and elevated intellectually and emotionally.

The one instance where the President used more words than Wills to say the same thing is in the word "cemetery." Lincoln reverted to a euphemism here and called it "a final resting place."

Consider this part of the long first sentence of the letter: "The several States having soldiers in the Army of the Potomac, who were killed at the Battle of Gettysburg, or have since died at the various hospitals which were established in the vicinity . . ." These 33 words became in the speech simply "those who here gave their lives . . ." Six short words.

Lincoln accepted Wills' word "consecrate," used it twice, but gave it a new and larger meaning. After saying it was "fitting and proper" to dedicate the cemetery, he turned the idea around and said that "in a larger sense," it could not be done because those who had fought there had already "consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract."

This phrase from the letter, ". . . the comrades of these brave dead, who are now in the tented field, or nobly meeting the foe at the front," came out in the speech as "The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here." Nine words doing the work of 21.

In his fifth paragraph, David Wills took 97 words to tell the President what his appearance there would mean: "a source of great gratification" to the widows and orphans of those killed there; that the battle's survivors would feel better for knowing that "they who sleep in death . . . are not forgotten by those highest in authority . . ." Lincoln rejected this idea as it was stated, but reshaped it. While characteristically dismissing his own role as unimportant, he greatly enlarged the scope of the dedication to say that it had meaning not merely to widows, orphans, and veterans of the battle, but to the whole world. As he said: "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here."

¹ The text of the letter contains 272 words, while the 5 versions of the address written out by Lincoln varied by a few words in length, up to 272.

In that sentence, incidentally, we all know that Lincoln's prophecy was wrong. To err in such humility only adds to his stature. With his ennobling words he undoubtedly made certain that the world would forget neither what was done or said there.

"The soldier dead on this battlefield," in the letter's last paragraph was converted in the speech to the three eloquent words, "these honored dead."

Finally we come to the most interesting and important part of the comparison, the theme of the speech: "Dedicate." It was suggested by Wills' letter but the word was not used. The letter said "These grounds will be consecrated and set apart to this sacred purpose," and in another place, "formally set apart these grounds." Lincoln compressed this into the one word "dedicate," used it six times, and greatly expanded and exalted the idea. Here he added the great, new dimension.

Incidentally, the use of the word "dedicate" shows an interesting point about Lincoln's writing: he never hesitated to repeat a word if it served his purpose. An even more striking example of this can be seen in the word "here"—found eight times in the speech.

One might say the use of this word "dedicate" was most natural, something anyone would have done, since the reason for the occasion was the dedication of a cemetery. Quite true, yet David Wills had not used it, and Lincoln's use of it, as we shall see, is far from the commonplace.

Mr. Wills said only that they were going to set apart a cemetery. But observe how in Lincoln's hands the theme became a much larger and nobler concept. No longer is it limited to setting apart a cemetery and its dead, but embraces a whole nation and its living, "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Lincoln not only dedicated a cemetery; he dedicated a nation to the eternal cause of freedom throughout the earth: "It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced . . . that we here highly resolve . . . that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Thus a theme that had its genesis in the prosaic setting apart of a burial ground ended magnificently embracing the earth and man's ageless struggle for freedom. How much further could an idea be extended? Who else has taken such ordinary clay and molded a masterpiece that will survive the centuries?

Whither Neutralism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, some years back Leo Durocher, who was never very concerned during his long baseball career over his "public image", but very much concerned with winning, commented that: "The nice guys finish last".

It certainly looks as if we, with our policy of being nice to everyone for fear of stepping on someone's toes, are in danger of finishing last insofar as the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations are concerned. Certainly, we seem to have failed to make a hit with Marshall Tito of Yugoslavia, who arranged the recent Belgrade Conference and, himself, followed the Red line throughout its

deliberations. One cannot help but wonder what his tack would have been if it had been the United States instead of the Soviet Union that had announced, just before the opening of his conference, that it was about to commence atmospheric nuclear testing once again.

I think it is time that we again started formulating our foreign policy on the basis of what is good for America, and to get over what appears to be our obsessive fear of the opinion of the rest of the world. I also think it is time we tried to sort out the bad guys from the good guys in the so-called "neutralist" camp too, and it is, therefore, most gratifying to note the fact that President Kennedy, on signing the recent foreign-aid authorization bill, said that, from now on, " . . . we should give great attention and consideration to those nations who have our views of the world crisis".

As evidence that this problem has caught the attention of the Nation, and that the President will have its support in any more-realistic distribution of our largesse than heretofore, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, the following two excellent editorials on this subject, the first from the Evening Press of Binghamton, N.Y., and the second from the Sun-Bulletin, also of Binghamton, N.Y., both of which editorials appeared on the same day, September 8, 1961:

[From the Evening Press, Binghamton, N.Y., Sept. 8, 1961]

HOW NEUTRAL THE NEUTRALISTS?

Leaders of the 25 nonaligned nations meeting at Belgrade have completed their sessions after finding much fault with the United States and little with Russia.

The Titos, Nehrus, Nassers & Co. long have known they can verbally blast the United States to kingdom come without loss of U.S. foreign aid. As a matter of fact, the more violent their condemnations of the United States the more U.S. aid they can expect.

These neutralist power boys exemplify more constraint in their judgments of the acts of Russia. At the recent Belgrade meeting, there were wordy abstractions about the disaster of war. The United States was called upon to abandon its naval base at Guantanamo Bay as a threat to the sovereignty of Castro's Cuba.

The neutralists, not so neutral, offered aid to the Algerians in their struggle with France. They talked endlessly about colonialism, but there was nary a word about Russian colonialism, about Russian domination of eastern Europe, about Red Chinese invasion of Tibet, nor about India's refusal to permit a plebiscite in Moslem Kashmir.

Amid the Belgrade babble, not a word was spoken in condemnation of Russian aggression. Most words spoken followed and supported the Khrushchev propaganda line. Nehru has said that Khrushchev was justified in barricading East Berlin from West Berlin.

No voices were raised at Belgrade in support of the principles of peace and international justice. There was no marshaling of moral forces against those out to destroy all human freedom.

Why should anything be expected from the meeting of power politicians at Belgrade? They were not true seekers after peace. They were not men upholding principles. They were men seeking aggrandizement of personal power and advantage in the international arena.

The neutralists, playing both sides of the street and loyal to no principles, are willing

to take anybody's money. And Uncle Sam is a ninny to think he can buy their friendship.

President Kennedy put the issue in true perspective this week when he said: "It is my belief that in the administration of these funds (foreign aid) we should give great attention and consideration to those nations who have our view of the world crisis."

Nehru, neutral on the side of Moscow, and Tito the Communist should be booted off the U.S. foreign aid gravy train. So should others of the "nonaligned" who know no principles beyond striving to be on the winning side.

Neutralism is a psychological contradiction in this or any other world. There can be no neutralism between right and wrong—between communism and freedom, between slavery and human decency.

[From the Sun-Bulletin, Binghamton, N.Y., Sept. 8, 1961]

NEUTRALISM

The trouble with neutralism is that it is an empty philosophy.

There are two powerful ideas in the world today. One is the Communist idea, which promises material rewards in the nebulous future and operates within the framework of authoritarian discipline. The other is the idea of freedom, which considers the individual more important than the state and which has proved, in some countries, that it can offer great material well-being right now.

One is a bully, which can start and stop wars at the whim of a ruling clique, which can heedlessly poison the air with radioactive fallout on a moment's notice, which can distort ordinary means of communication and human understanding into weapons of imperialism.

The other is a system which enjoys the strengths and weaknesses of freedom, which operates well only when the solemn pledge is honored and the law of nations observed, which must move slowly within an atmosphere of argument and controversy, which can react strongly in self-defense but is often weak on the offensive.

To say, as the neutralists do, that these two ideas are equal, and that some nations can be magnificently disinterested in whether one or the other survives, is either to confess moral bankruptcy or to help the bully.

The best proof of this came in the neutralist appeal to the United States and the Soviet Union to negotiate their differences. The United States has always been willing to negotiate on burning issues. So has the Soviet Union. The difference between the two great nations is that the United States usually enters such negotiations with a genuine desire for a successful conclusion of the negotiations. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, considers negotiation to be an end in itself, another weapon in its struggle to rule the world.

Look at what happened to the meetings in Geneva, which were supposed to bring about an agreement to end nuclear testing once and for all. No agreement was reached, because of Soviet intransigence. Indeed, when the United States went very far to meet the original Soviet demands, the Kremlin welshed on its own demands and wound up announcing that it would resume nuclear testing.

The Belgrade appeal would have been a more serious document if it had recognized that in international affairs, as in human affairs, there is a difference between right and wrong, between good and evil. Instead, the doctrine of noncommittal appears to mean that the neutralists continue to take no sides in the conflict between good and evil. This is not exactly the most valuable contribution to the cause of humanity.

Donated by the People of the United States Under the Kennedy Catholic Aid Program

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a column by Miss Dorothy Kilgallen, which is thought provoking.

Many Members have expressed an interest in the contents of this article and the accuracy of the information supplied to Miss Kilgallen.

I have had an opportunity to discuss the matter with Miss Kilgallen and, based on the information supplied, I am convinced she accurately reported the information as supplied to her.

Further comment on this matter will be submitted at a later date.

The article follows:

COBWEB POISONING STRIKES STAR OF SPOOK FILMS, ENDS HER TOUR
(By Dorothy Kilgallen)

Barbara Steele, the Liz Taylor of the spook films, has had to cancel her personal appearance tour on behalf of "The Pit and the Pendulum." She flew back to Hollywood from Chicago with a temperature of 104. Jim Nicholson, president of American-International Pictures, arrived in New York from Europe and dashed to the west coast immediately, greatly concerned over his star's condition.

The first doctor to examine Barbara after she complained of not feeling well diagnosed her illness as "cobweb poisoning," believe it or not; in other words, she'd inhaled too much of the spray used to make cobwebs on movie sets. At any rate, her 22-city tour is off.

Communique from a seaman whose identity is withheld for obvious reasons: "I have just returned from South America and north Africa. Giveaway flour and wheat to Colombia, Morocco, Libya, and others—tons of it—doesn't seem to be reaching the needy.

"In Colombia, the people were storming the ship's garbage cans. In Casablanca, hungry men and women were stopped by armed police from scooping up grains of wheat on the wharf. I asked scores of people in Buenaventura what happens to the wheat down there—donated by the people of the United States under the Kennedy Catholic aid program marked on each bag. To the hospitals? No. To the schools? No. Then where does it go?"

It might be worth finding out since an American flagship carrying this bounty costs \$3,000 to run. The trouble about these international transactions is that those who know do not speak and those who speak do not know. But if even a portion of the giveaway stuff is falling into the most deserving hands there is no doubt that the Americans are receiving more kicks than kudos for it. Ask any American seaman—he needs a bodyguard in most places.

It reminds me of what Churchill said in 1941 when his chief of staff told him that so-and-so hated the P.M. "I can't think why; I've never done him any favors."

Both Audrey Hepburn and Shirley MacLaine were saddened by the news of the sudden death of writer Cameron Shipp. The well-known magazine profiler had recently completed assignments as unit publicity man

for their latest films, "Breakfast at Tiffany's" and "My Geisha," and their admiration for him was boundless.

Ted Williams spent the day at the Lido on Long Island with glamor girl Neva More, and went almost completely unrecognized. He was in disguise, for him—he wore a necktie.

Freddy Wittop, who will design the costumes for the Broadway musical "Subways Are for Sleeping," has lived in New York for 20 years but took his first subway ride last week because of his new assignment.

Report to the AMA

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I take pleasure in introducing into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "A Report to the AMA." The article was written by Mr. Frank Getlein, the art critic of our Washington Evening Star, and comes from his forthcoming book, "A Modern Demonology."

I introduce this article, Mr. Speaker, partly for the amusement of my fellow Members of Congress. Our is a serious business, and it is all too infrequently that such a delightful treatment of an issue with which we are all concerned comes across my desk.

But I urge my fellow Members to give this article a second reading. As is the case with many spoofs of the special interests which we are, from time to time, called upon to deal, there is a great amount of truth among the entertainment.

The article follows:

A REPORT TO THE AMA

(By Frank Getlein)

Today, gentlemen, medicine faces its gravest crisis since the rise of chiropractic. Once again we are surrounded by demons. They are stronger than ever. They come at us from all directions. And, there is no use kidding ourselves, in recent years they have gained much ground and from these gains they are in a much better position to press their attack to its logical conclusion, namely, the death of organized medicine as we know it today.

The cry today is for medical care for the old folks. But you know and I know that medical care for the old folks will be but the prelude to universal health insurance for all, or socialized medicine.

On the odd chance that there are among you some who doubt the inevitability of this sequence, let me remind the convention of my own humble and, I regret to say, futile part in warning the members against the early signs of the dread disease when first they appeared. The first symptoms, you will recall, centered on the request for prepaid group insurance for hospital care. The whole thing was said to have no relationship at all to doctors but merely to be a helpful budgeting device for potential patients. Many in the profession, I am sorry to have to recall, were deceived by this plea and went along with the request. For myself and a few others, as soon as we spotted the word "group," we knew we were in the presence

of socialism. We said so at the time, we have said so ever since, and we say so today. Anything that casts even the slightest shadow over the sacred relationship between the doctor and his patient's finances is socialism.

As we predicted, it was not long before the next stage set in: The impertinent demand that doctor fees too be insured against, as if we were a kind of natural disaster. Over our protest, the profession again acceded to the socialist demons. Rate schedules for doctors were set up, like those for air travel or Caribbean cruises. Doctors were paid, not by the patient, but by the group, as if a group ever had consumption, vapors, or tired blood.

The key point, however, was that fees were known in advance. We were deep in trouble, but there was worse to come. The rate of progress of the disease became terrifying. First, there was treason within the profession. Young doctors, motivated by a false idealism, joined together in group practice. Even as the British rose to Benedict Arnold, demoniacal labor unions embraced these traitors. Unions built their own hospitals. They formed their own groups and pushed the whole insurance scheme into preventive medicine. Worst of all, they laid rough and untrained hands upon the very heart of the science of healing; they began the first study by outsiders of medical costs.

Now the disease has reached its climax. Socialized medicine—under various more palatable names—is the avowed goal of wide areas of the population and even the Government. If it comes—and we cannot be optimistic that it won't—the profession will be ruined. Bureaucrats will demand a fixed scale of prices. The frontiers of free enterprise will be fenced in. The advance of medicine will grind to a halt. I, for one, freely predict that, if we are socialized, many of the profession's brightest lights will return, in sorrow, to the mother trade, barbering, where at least they'll get tips.

One of our greatest problems is communicating our concern to our patients. "After all, what difference does it make?" is a question asked by people of good will and small brain. "Look to England," they go on, "surely the citizens there are better off medically than they used to be?"

Well may they say, "Look at England." Look at her. Every tatterdemalion lounge and loiterer in London sports a wig and a set of false teeth, while the empire's gone glimmering after Babylon and Tyre. That's what socialized medicine's done for England.

What we have to get across to patients and to voters is the fundamental connection between the fee system and the march of medicine. Without fees, and big ones, too, there would have been no wonder drugs, no antibiotics, no tranquilizers, no Paul de Kruif. Once upon a time, you know, we had socialized medicine. When we were all barbers, we were thoroughly socialized, employees of the State in military or courtly service. What did you get then in the line of treatment? You got leeches and blood-letting generally. You got herbs and rare earths. You got the water cure. You got the phases of the moon. You got cysters of simply enormous sizes. The best thing a doctor could do for you then was to give you a shave and a haircut.

Two bits.

Just about what the treatments were worth. This system continued basically right into this century, with the doctor a kind of community functionary, handing out folk remedies to the folks and taking his pay in chickens and parsnips, much like the parson.

Abruptly, everything changed. The march of medicine began. We cured syphilis, typhoid, bubonic plague. We discovered aller-

gies and psychoanalysis, two of the most fruitful fields a man can enter. Geriatrics, pediatrics, gynecology, and many others came out of the nowhere, and mankind climbed steeply toward a new era of tranquillity. What brought all this on?

In a word: Cash.

When America moved from the country into town, people no longer had the poultry and produce they used to pay their doctors with. They had to pay cash. Doctors moved from the lower middle class to the middle middle class to the upper middle class. They got rich. And, as in every other breakthrough on the frontiers of free enterprise from the spinning Jenny to the singing commercial, the benefits filtered down from those on top, the entrepreneurs, to those on the bottom, the customers. For example, we have been so successful in fighting infant mortality that we've had to go in for birth control. Other beneficiaries are the oil-well business, the modern-art business, and the travel business.

This has happened because the fee system is solidly rooted in Nature herself. I dare say there isn't a doctor in the house who hasn't said to his patients, "We don't cure you; we only cooperate with nature."

Nowhere is that cooperation more direct and more effective than in the therapeutic application of fees, based as they are on the patient's ability to pay, with just a touch added on top of that ability. It is precisely that touch, calculated with exquisite delicacy and applied with the inexorability of doom, that has made America the healthiest Nation of its size in history. The constant presence of that touch activates nature, and nature, deep in the patient's subconscious, keeps him healthy most of the time and gets him healthy fast when he does fall sick.

We tamper with nature at our peril.

However clear this fundamental rule of healing is to us, we must admit that the general public does not understand it and the Members of Congress understand it least of all. It must therefore be our constant concern to get the point across. I have nothing but commendation for those doctors who, for the last several years, have been prefacing each consultation with little sermonettes on socialized medicine and the sanctity of the patient-doctor relationship. Medical research has shown these to be extra effective when given as anesthesia is taking hold just before a major operation.

It is vital, of course, to keep up your payments to the emergency fund in Washington. We have for long had the largest lobby in town, but we must increase our staff and increase our efforts. The population explosion and the creation of new States of the Union have been sending new Members of Congress to the capital yearly. Our people must meet them all, carry their bags, get them a cab, and in general show them that doctors are their friends. Naturally, this takes financial support; I can assure you that there is no better investment and, like most of you, I'm something of an expert in the investment field.

Some imaginative freedom fighters have combined these two techniques. Heavy givers to the emergency fund, they have prorated their donations among their patients and explained, by a sticker on the statement, that the surcharge will cease when the socializing threat ceases. The sticker also has room for the name of the Congressman to write to. For anyone wishing to join the effort, a stack of statement-stickers will be found, appropriately, in the lobby.

But whether, as an individual practitioner, you adopt these new medical techniques or just continue in the invaluable, day-in, day-out campaign of doubling all fees when groups are involved, I urge eternal vigilance and renewed dedication to the professional ideal expressed in the chorus of the Hymn to Hippocrates:

Don't let them take it away.

Israel: A David in a World of Goliaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. News & World Report of September 18, 1961, has published a most timely statement on the great spiritual, economic and governmental progress of the State of Israel.

It is my opinion that there is enough significance attached to this article to have it become a part of this RECORD.

The article follows:

ISRAEL: A DAVID IN A WORLD OF GOLIATHS

(At a time when great nations are worrying about survival—look at tiny Israel. Here is what is being done by a country of few people, with almost no natural resources—and surrounded by enemies.)

As a nation, Israel is only 13 years old. In area, it is smaller than Massachusetts. It has only 2.1 million inhabitants—about the same number as the city of Philadelphia.

Yet Israel already has entered the space age. It fired a solid-fuel rocket 50 miles into the ionosphere last July 5, and now is aiming at higher altitudes.

Israel long has been in the atomic age, with one big uranium reactor in operation and with a larger reactor under construction.

In developing solar energy, Israel is among the world's leaders. For 6 years it has been marketing solar water heaters and is now developing solar refrigerators and air conditioners. An experimental plant is producing steam power from solar energy.

Located in a part of the world that is mostly underdeveloped and scientifically backward, Israel has established itself among the most advanced nations of the world in technology.

MILITARY POWER: IMPRESSIVE

Surrounded by hostile Arab nations, which outnumber Israelis many times in manpower, Israel has built a military force that twice has proved more than a match for its Arab foes.

The Israeli Army is recognized as one of the strongest in the Mideast.

Military equipment made in Israel is being exported to Europe. The Dutch Defense Ministry recently placed a substantial order for Israel's "Uzi" machine pistols. Israel produces its own jet trainer planes and soon will enter the field of commercial aviation with a twin-engine jet aircraft design and built in Israel.

Although there is a shortage of almost all kinds of natural resources, Israel is economic self-sufficiency from its barren soil.

With a shortage of native iron ore, Israel has pioneered in developing a structural concrete which requires a minimum of steel, and has become one of the world's leading exporters of concrete. In Israel, tall buildings—up to 20 stories—are built with hardly any steel girders.

Although the young nation's land has no diamond mines, Israel has become a world leader in diamond cutting and polishing.

Israel has no timber, yet is a large producer and exporter of plywood, made of lumber imported from Africa.

INGENIOUS WITH WATER

Water is seriously short in most of Israel. So the Israelis have developed a number of ingenious ways to overcome that shortage. This country's agriculture is based on irriga-

tion. The entire country is criss-crossed by a grid of underground pipelines. The Jerusalem area gets all its water through pipes from the coastal plains. Plans for settling the Negev Desert area call for piping water into that arid region.

Schemes to desalinate sea water are far advanced here. Brackish water is already being made usable for agriculture economically. Water is soon to be taken from the Red Sea for both drinking and irrigation.

Well over 80 percent of Israel's consumer goods are home manufactured. Such things as record players, radios and refrigerators are even exported. Automobiles, trucks and buses are assembled here, with many of their components manufactured here. Israel has to import its wool and leather, but the nation produces all its own clothing and footwear.

In scientific research, Israel scientists frequently come up with original discoveries that are sold abroad.

ONLY SURPLUS: TALENT

The only natural resource that Israel has in abundance is its supply of engineers, scientists, doctors and skilled technicians. In many of these fields, Israel has a surplus.

So now Israel is exporting its technical know-how to many of the less-advanced nations that surround Israel in Asia and Africa.

Some of this export is aimed at winning friends among Israel's unfriendly neighbors. Even Arab countries that are openly hostile to Israel are accepting the help of Israel experts and technicians.

In all, more than 700 Israelis are working in 35 countries, helping them to modernize their industries, economies and even their armed forces.

When Israel declared itself an independent nation in 1948, the odds seemed high against its survival.

Now Israel is being watched by old as well as new nations around the world as evidence of what a determined people can do against great odds.

Tribute to a Wise and Farsighted Police Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Ralph McGill, one of the most distinguished of American newspapermen, that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of September 10, 1961. Let us hope that Atlanta's example will inspire other cities and communities in this country to do as much good with as much dignity.

The article follows:

THE COPS WROTE THEMES

(By Ralph McGill)

Add notes on southern scene: A somewhat bored reporter, on the third day after Atlanta's calm and incident-free desegregation of high schools said, as he prepared to quit the city: "Get Bruce Catton to write this. Let him call it A Stillness at Atlanta."

Perhaps the best behind-the-scenes chapter of this story of southern people at their best is that of Police Chief Herbert Jenkins. His origin was rural Georgia. He worked hard, was self-taught, and has been a church-going man.

The finest tribute paid him was by one of his own officers. Two days after the quiet,

well received process of desegregation, one of his sergeants said, in conversation with a newspaperman:

"You know, I found myself out there at one of the schools all keyed up to do my job as a policeman. There was a time to wait and I found myself thinking that I was surprised at myself. I really have been opposed to desegregation. I have had maybe the usual southern attitude about Negroes."

"It was not more than 3 or 4 years ago," he continued, "I was surprised to find myself saying Negroes instead of niggers—as I had grown up to say. I guess maybe I wish even now that things were the same. But what puzzled me was that on the morning the desegregation was to take place I was dead determined that the thing would go off without any hoodlums or fanatics, especially the juvenile punks, doing anything to harm the children who were coming to school. And I found myself admiring, somewhat to my astonishment, the Negro kids. I wondered what they and their families had felt and talked about the 2 or 3 days before school. I admitted to myself they had courage."

"You know why I felt like this—as well as a lot of others on the force? It's the chief. He has been having us read things issued by the Government and sources we believed in. He saw to it we studied what happened at Little Rock, New Orleans, Birmingham, Anniston, and Montgomery. Maybe the worst was in Alabama. Maybe you saw what that judge said about the Montgomery police force. A cop has pride in being a cop. It made you ashamed to read about those in Alabama."

"But the chief did something else. He had us do homework. We had to write themes. My boy sure kidded me. There I was, at home, trying to write a theme. And all the rest of us doing the same. Imagine, sweating over a theme. The chief had given us a factual report on law enforcement in southern cities where there had been trouble. We each had to write 300 words of evaluation on it. You reckon there is another police force in the Nation where the officers have to write themes? A lot of the boys didn't like it. Not at first. But later they all took a sort of pride in it. A cop is a human being. And the chief was, in effect, saying to us, 'Look, study this. You are not dopes. Write what you think about it.'"

"So, we did," he said. "We came to see what had happened in other cities. The worst are the teenagers. I guess they need psychiatric help. But, a cop has to contend with them when they are what they are. Whatever it was that got them off on the wrong track and made them problem kids happened before the cop meets with them. He is not a contributing factor. He is confronted with a teenager who has a grudge against life or who is one of those who says, after he has killed someone, or maimed someone, he guesses he was seeking a thrill. Or, he is one who has been paid \$5 to create an incident. He has a knife, or a gun, or he will pick up rocks or a stick and slug school-children or teachers. The cop must act. The loss of a minute and the damage has been done."

"In all these other cities the teenage problem crowd was the hard core of the mobs and the rioters. The chief impressed on us that we could think what we liked—but that we were the arm of the law. Enforcement of the law is our job. Also, in our study, we got a new pride in our town."

"Anyhow," he said, "there wasn't any trouble. I saw the young Negro kids come in, well dressed and polite as the others. And I decided this couldn't really be so wrong. So, pretty soon school was out and everyone seemed glad that at last the long-anticipated day had come and gone. But we couldn't have done it without the chief. He is a teacher as well as a chief. My boy keeps asking me when I am going to have some more homework."

Food for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of our colleagues the following brief pamphlet published recently by the National Farmers Union. Its message is the most human of all: technological advances in agriculture have now—for the first time in history—made it possible to feed adequately the whole of the vast multitudes of the world.

The burden of this responsibility lies with America and food for peace is, perhaps, the most noteworthy contribution we can make to the settlement of the world's problems.

The text of the pamphlet follows:

FOOD FOR PEACE

The hunger of human beings is among the oldest and most compelling problems of man's history. For thousands of years, human conflict and pestilence have stemmed in large part from man's inability to wrest from the soil enough food to satisfy his needs.

In our own day, the cold war feeds upon this same failure of food supply. Frequently the titanic struggle between totalitarian and the free worlds focuses upon the simple question: "How can we get bread?"—a query asked with new insistence by millions of fathers and mothers all over the world.

The question is old because hunger, acute and chronic, is an ancient reality. But the accent and insistency are new because the fact of vast abundance in some nations and the possibility to secure sufficiency for all nations are the glad tidings and new promise of our age.

For the first time in history, the capacity now exists to wipe out starvation and its attendant evils in the entire human family. Today's imperative is to so distribute current abundance that it not only feeds the hungry but, along with other worldwide efforts, promotes technical development and economic growth.

This abundance is a blessing. The power to produce more abundantly is a greater blessing still. Instead of viewing our good earth and her hundred-fold fruits as paralyzing perplexities, we must give thanks to God and we must apply our full powers to fulfill His will for all the human family.

Only to preach peace and freedom as Judeo-Christian principles to people still held by hunger, at a time when we have abundance to remove their bonds, is hypocrisy. The living word must give life to deeds. Abstract justice and charity are not enough. These virtues by themselves cannot teach how best to work the land. They cannot turn waste areas into fields of plenty. They cannot instruct millions of mothers in choosing a rounded diet. Justice and charity become lifegiving through laws and programs, agencies and projects, staffs and tools.

Food and fiber, combined with well-coordinated programs of technical and economic assistance, can be used to build a better economic foundation for emerging nations. Long-range commitments of food and fiber can act as a basis for their overall programs of socioeconomic development.

Men who obtain enough food for themselves and their families will readily devote their energies and intelligence to achieving new and better ways of life through education and application to economic activity.

Great strides have been taken in recent years by the technically advanced nations in helping to raise standards of life in developing areas of the world. But much work needs to be done.

Roughly three-fourths of the people in the developing nations are engaged in agriculture. Still, they do not produce enough to feed themselves. They do not harvest enough variety to provide their people with nutritious diets. Many of our neighbors are still using primitive tools, and applying ancient farming methods. Frequently, prolonged drought and other natural catastrophes destroy much of the already meager harvest. Disease often wipes out livestock in wide areas.

A beginning has been made to make available to needy nations the kind of food which more nearly meet the requirements of a health-giving diet. Donor nations might well encourage their farmers to grow more of the foods rich in protein and convert more of the starchy foods into meats and fats. A contribution of such foods would be vastly more beneficial to the people of the developing nations.

Token technical assistance to date demonstrates what can be done. A program of the Food and Agriculture Organization has made an attack upon rinderpest, for years the greatest killer disease of livestock. An English doctor with a simple serum, used widely in advanced nations, stopped the spread of the disease among the food animals of Thailand. The disease had killed virtually all the animal life in some sections of the country the year before.

Instruction in conservation and the use of fertilizer has already doubled the harvest in some regions. More than a third of the earth cannot be put to effective use because lack of rainfall makes it difficult, if not impossible, for plants, animals, and men to survive. The arid zone research jointly engaged in by FAO and UNESCO is reclaiming land for productive use as fast as research can be applied to actual programs. The construction of dams, reservoirs, and irrigation ditches has already turned some desert lands into productive fields in parts of Africa and the Middle East.

But mankind has only begun to utilize the productive potential of the earth. He has only begun to rejuvenate the soil of the tired old earth.

Much machinery is already available to bring technical assistance to developing nations. Some Western countries, working individually, have initiated aid programs on a small scale. Through the United Nations and voluntary organizations, advanced nations have joined together for a combined effort.

The FAO of the United Nations is working in many ways to improve farm production and distribution of food and fiber throughout the world. Improved land use and tenure, vaccination, and crossbreeding of animals, and nutritional diets, are just some of the provinces in which the Organization is concerned. Through its new freedom from hunger campaign, it is alerting people everywhere to the need for national action programs seeking to free the world from hunger by means of increased production and improved distribution. UNICEF and the World Health Organization (WHO) are working to distribute food and improve diets of undernourished peoples.

The International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) brings together farm leaders and farm organizations throughout the world. IFAP has long worked for progress toward an international food policy to be subscribed to by the governments of IFAP member organizations, and the emerging nations as well.

CARE, CROP, the Heifer Project, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish relief services, agricultural missions, and other church and lay programs are making significant voluntary efforts. These agencies, however, are

working with limited budgets. Other major steps have been proposed and are needed. Among these is a proposal for a World Food Board, including an international food and fiber reserve. Such a food "bank" could make possible effective distribution from areas of abundance to areas of need. The Food for Peace program of our own Government is doing much and, with an increased understanding among the American people, can accomplish vastly more to make meaningful use of our tremendous productive capacity applied to the food needs of hungry people.

The long-range effect of all such programs, however, will depend upon the immediate distribution of world abundance where it is needed, in workable ways that will not disrupt or harm the economies of the receiving countries. Most developing nations cannot afford to import commercially the food and fiber they need. What some nations do import is usually purchased at the expense of other programs, such as schools, hospitals, and irrigation and drainage systems.

A great obstacle to the development of nations stems from the fact that much of their manpower is tied up in agriculture. Commitments of food and fiber, coupled with technological assistance, can free more of the working force for industrial development, increase the social services, and serve to implement improved production techniques in agriculture. These developments, in turn, would provide jobs and income for more people, bringing the economy of the Nation as a whole into better balance.

To assure maximum benefit from our American abundance, programs of social and economic assistance should be entirely separated from defense or security projects. Our food and fiber are tools for peace.

As citizens of the United States, we particularly commend our food-for-peace program, currently receiving new impetus. This great demonstration of the American people for the hungry of the world conforms to our moral responsibilities and demands our continuing support.

This is the promise and the challenge of today. Free nations are preparing the soil for peace rather than war. The seeds of peace are being planted in the fertile soil of advanced nations as the product of the fields is applied to needs of the human family.

Can we nourish these seeds more rapidly than the seeds of war growing now in far-flung fields of underdeveloped nations?

There can be no enduring peace and freedom with half the world enslaved to hunger. There is no more compelling a master.

The free nations of the world spend billions each year for protection against war. We still spend so little for peace.

We, the undersigned, impelled by our religious convictions, are determined to strive for real peace within the human family, peace where there is no hunger or poverty.

The food-for-peace program is endorsed by the following:

From the Protestant community:
Rev. Norman J. Baugher, Elgin, Ill.
Prof. John C. Bennett, New York, N.Y.
Rev. James R. Bullock, Jackson, Tenn.
Rev. Eugene Carson Blake, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Howard A. Cowden, Kansas City, Mo.
Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. Purd Dietz, St. Louis, Mo.
Dr. Harold C. Fey, Chicago, Ill.
Prof. George Forrell, Maywood, Ill.
Rev. Luther A. Gotwald, New York, N.Y.
Rev. Shirley E. Greene, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. Cameron P. Hall, New York, N.Y.
Rev. Reginald Helferich, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. Fred Hoskins, New York, N.Y.
Dr. F. Ernest Johnson, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Benson Y. Landis, New York, N.Y.
Rt. Rev. Arthur C. Lichtenberger, New York, N.Y.

Rev. Edgar A. Love, Baltimore, Md.
Rev. Kenneth L. Maxwell, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Edward O. Moe, Lansing, Mich.
Rev. Ira W. Moomaw, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Ray Newton, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Victor Obenhaus, Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Paul C. Payne, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mr. Clarence Pickett, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, San Francisco, Calif.

Rev. Clyde Rogers, Columbus, Ohio.
Rev. W. Harold Row, Elgin, Ill.
Mr. Mervin G. Smith, Columbus, Ohio.
Dr. James E. Wagner, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mr. Lloyd C. Wicke, New York, N.Y.
Rev. Willard M. Wickizer, Indianapolis, Ind.
Rev. Herman Will, Jr., Chicago, Ill.
From the Catholic community:
Most Rev. Leo A. Pursley, D.D., Episcopal adviser, NCRLC.

Most Rev. Joseph M. Marling, D.D., president, NCRLC.

Most Rev. Edward E. Swanstrom, D.D., executive director, Catholic Relief Services, NCWC.

Rev. Anthony J. Adams, S.J., Pueblo, Colo.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Urban Baer, Eastman, Wis.
Rev. Francis A. Candon, Fairfield, Vt.
Rev. Thurston N. Davis, S.J., New York, N.Y.

Rev. Michael P. Dineen, Milwaukee, Wis.
Rev. Edward Duff, S.J., St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. Roy Figlino, Brighton, Colo.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. F. Frommherz, Ottoville, Ohio.

Rev. Joseph B. Gremillion, New York, N.Y.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins, Washington, D.C.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George J. Hildner, Villa Ridge, Mo.
Rev. Joseph Hylden, Grafton, N. Dak.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Luigi G. Ligutti, Vatican City, Europe.

Miss Julia F. Maguire, Topeka, Kans.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. McCarthy, New York, N.Y.

Mrs. Mary Jean McGrath, Madison, Wis.
Rev. Frederick McGuire, C.M., Washington, D.C.

Miss Margaret Mealey, Washington, D.C.
Mr. F. Robert Melina, New York, N.Y.
Rev. George M. Nell, Island Grove, Ill.

Mr. James J. Norris, New York, N.Y.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Edward W. O'Rourke, Des Moines, Iowa.

Miss Betsy Phelan, Kansas City, Mo.
Rev. Francis J. Phelan, Eagle Grove, Iowa.
Dr. Paul Sacco, New Orleans, La.

Mr. Martin Salm, Chilton, Wis.
Dr. Elmer L. Sauer, Champaign, Ill.
Rev. Wilfred J. Schuster, Madison, Wis.

Mr. Edward S. Skillin, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Paul C. Taff, Ames, Iowa.
Rev. James L. Vizzard, S.J., Washington, D.C.

Rev. John George Weber, Des Moines, Iowa.
Mr. Donald Willette, Delavan, Minn.
Mr. Martin H. Work, Washington, D.C.

From the Jewish community:
Judge Emil N. Baar, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Bernard J. Bamberger, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Samuel Belkin, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, Rochester, N.Y.
Mr. Norman Cousins, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Herbert Ehrmann, Brookline, Mass.
Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Irving Jay Fain, Providence, R.I.
Mr. Moses Feuerstein, Lawrence, Mass.
Dr. Louis Finkelstein, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Nelson Glueck, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Mr. I. Cyrus Gordon, Rockville Centre, N.Y.
Rabbi Harry Halpern, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Adolph Held, New York, N.Y.
Mrs. Charles Hymes, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Morris Iushewitz, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Bernath Jacobs, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Irving Kane, Cleveland, Ohio.
Mr. Label A. Katz, New Orleans, La.
Mr. Philip M. Klutznick, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Isaiah Minkoff, New York, N.Y.
Hon. Abraham J. Multer, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Theodore Norman, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Jacob Pat, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Joachim Prinz, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Edward T. Sandrow, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Bernard Segal, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Albert Vorspan, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Lewis H. Weinstein, Boston, Mass.
Dr. Samson Weiss, New York, N.Y.

Nuclear Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the dimensions of the problem now confronting us over Germany have never been more sharply or dramatically stated than by Walter Lippmann in this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. Lippmann has correctly pointed out that the destructiveness of nuclear weapons—weapons which can easily destroy our world as we know it today—leave us with no historical precedents with which to deal with our present crisis.

He has clearly explained that while nuclear war would be lunacy, it is a possibility if one side miscalculates the breaking point of the other, and he has described some of these critical areas.

Recognizing these factors, Mr. Lippmann has stated in ringing terms a paramount rule of international politics in this nuclear age "that a great nuclear power must not put another great nuclear power in a position where it must choose between suicide and surrender. And that no great nuclear power must put itself in a position where it has made such absolute and such rigid stipulations that it can no longer negotiate an honorable and tolerable accommodation."

This is a penetrating and timely article, Mr. Speaker, which comes at a moment when our country stands in great peril. I urge my colleagues to give this essay their close attention:

NUCLEAR DIPLOMACY

(By Walter Lippmann)

Never before have any chiefs of state been in a situation like that in Germany today. For this is the first encounter on vital issues between great nuclear powers, and there are no historical precedents, there is no accumulated experience and wisdom, to guide them. Khrushchev and Kennedy possess what are for all practical purposes equal and absolute weapons. Khrushchev and Kennedy, Macmillan, De Gaulle, and Adenauer are working under conditions as different from World War II as flying a jet is different from running a steam locomotive. None of them has been taught how to conduct diplomacy in a nuclear age. All of them have to guess and to improvise, to experiment and to hope.

There has been a revolution in the military situation since the previous encounter

over Berlin with Stalin in 1948. Then the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But beginning with the late fifties the Soviet Union with its nuclear weapons and its rockets has become an equal nuclear power. During the critical fifties Churchill and Eisenhower learned what was happening to the balance of power. Then the era of summitry began. At the beginning of this era Eisenhower made the statement for which, it may well be, he will be remembered the longest. It was not sentimentality, idealism, or pacifism, but the grim truth about the hydrogen bomb which caused President Eisenhower to say that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

Modern weapons have not merely magnified and multiplied the violence of war. They have revolutionized the nature of war by introducing into it a new order of violence. Always until now, war and the threat of war, whether aggressive or defensive, were usable instruments for the national purpose. They were usable because wars could still be won or lost. In the pre-nuclear wars the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. The damage, though great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union. But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean a hundred million dead, the devastation of the great urban centers, and the contamination of the earth, the water, and the air, there would be no such recovery. The damage done would be mutual, there would be no victor, and for all practical purposes the ruin would be irreparable.

American nuclear power can reduce Soviet society to smoldering ruins and leave the wretched survivors shocked, starving, and diseased. The Soviet Union can, it is coolly estimated, kill between 30 and 70 million Americans. Such a war would not be followed by reconstruction. It would be followed by a savage struggle for existence as the survivors crawled out of their shelters and the American Republic would be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

It used to be said of the British naval commander in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the war in an afternoon. Khrushchev and Kennedy can do that now. In a few hours Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the achievements and the promises of the Communist economy; Kennedy can lose the Constitution and the free enterprise system and the American way of life, and along with them all the frontiers, old and new. I do not think that this is overstated. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred since man appeared on this planet. In saying this my object is not to add to the general creepiness. But we cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter unless we remind ourselves that nuclear war is not just another war as history describes wars, but a wholly new order of violence.

Because the destructiveness of the new armaments is equal and virtually absolute neither of the two chiefs of government can threaten the other with such a war. As long as each has kept his own armory of weapons in order, neither can or need believe the nuclear threats of the other. If, for example, Khrushchev has resumed testing, not for technical military reasons but for terrorization, he will not and cannot terrorize President Kennedy. For this testing cannot remove the awful retaliatory power of the United States nuclear weapon systems.

In cold blood no government can, no government will, start a nuclear war with an equal nuclear power. Only a moral idiot

would press the button. The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea what they are talking about. They have not been able to imagine and realize what a nuclear war would be like. But the governments know quite well what a nuclear war would be like. That is why there is bluff at the core of any threat to initiate a nuclear exchange. There is also a wishful belief that the bluff will work because it will not be called.

Nevertheless, though a nuclear war would be lunacy and is unlikely it is an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however, irrational it may be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to a point where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings.

This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. It is as much a reality as a megaton bomb, and in the nuclear age it must be given weighty consideration in the calculation of policy. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which the reactions are uncontrollable. The governments must know where that line is and they must stay well back of it. Here lies the greatest danger of miscalculation, and therefore of war.

Both sides, we had better realize, are capable of miscalculating where that line is. Khrushchev, who has no sufficient experience of a state whose speech is free, is prone to think that Kennedy can and should control an explosion of popular feeling. The fact is that there is a limit to President Kennedy's ability to lead public opinion, and he is in sight of that limit. Mr. Khrushchev must make no mistake about this.

For our part, we are prone to suppose that because speech is strictly regimented in the Soviet Union, that there is no irresistible internal pressures on Khrushchev. This can be a very dangerous illusion.

In both countries there is a line which it is not safe for the other to cross. It is the line where compromise will be regarded as humiliation and surrender. This line will have to be made precise in the negotiations. Blockade of the access routes is such a line for this country. For the Soviet Union such a line would be the giving of nuclear arms to West Germany. These are lines of provocation which cannot be crossed without provoking uncontrollable, indeed suicidal, reactions.

This being the nuclear age it is the paramount rule of international politics that a great nuclear power must not put another great nuclear power in a position where it must choose between suicide and surrender. And the corollary of this rule is that no great nuclear power must put itself in a position where it has made such absolute and such rigid stipulations that it can no longer negotiate an honorable and tolerable accommodation.

Surplus Properties for YM and YWCA's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies.

My bill would broaden the eligibility of recipients of surplus property under the law to allow certain tax-supported or

tax-exempt welfare and recreation agencies to take advantage of surplus properties being disposed of by the Government. Under the present law, these properties may be donated only to schools, colleges, civil defense organizations, medical institutions, health centers, and related institutions.

These agencies, which would be added to the eligibility list to receive donable surplus property, contribute significantly to our society and our way of life. These agencies, the YM and YWCA's, religious groups of all denominations, boys clubs, and the like are a valuable asset to our Nation. They deal with the bodies and souls of our citizens and make contributions to their betterment.

The donation of surplus properties to these agencies will enable them to expand their programs. Every little help to these agencies is valuable to them, and the people they serve.

The spirit of charity, which prevails in America, has spurred outstanding activity in the field of privately supported welfare and recreation agencies. This bill seeks to enable these agencies to take advantage of surplus material to expand their program. I urge prompt and favorable committee action on this measure.

Progress Report on National Milk Sanitation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the September 11, 1961, Capital Times, Madison, Wis., which reviews the progress that has been made on national milk sanitation legislation. My colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman LESTER JOHNSON, is the author of this bill and has been working hard for the past 5 years to secure its passage and enactment into law. While I was not a Member of Congress when he introduced his first national milk sanitation bill in the 85th Congress, I was glad to join him in introducing and supporting this very important and worthwhile measure in the 86th and 87th Congresses.

The editorial follows:

DAIRY FARMERS IN STATE GET BOOST FROM FREEMAN

Dairy farmers in Wisconsin and other Midwestern States have just been given a big boost by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, who has recently come out in favor of a bill to eliminate unrealistic barriers that hamper the interstate flow of milk.

The bill is sponsored by Congressman LESTER JOHNSON (Democrat, Black River Falls). JOHNSON tried in vain for several years to get Agriculture Department support for the move from Ezra Benson. With a change in administrations, and a change in philosophy in the Department, JOHNSON stands on the verge of success. Now several

Congressmen—including many Republicans—from the Midwest have climbed on the bandwagon.

At present there are scores of State and local sanitary rules and inspection requirements which serve as a wall holding back the free flow of milk. JOHNSON and his supporters—now including the Secretary of Agriculture—want a uniform national code for milk sanitary standards. They believe this code will give consumers ample protection and at the same time treat all dairymen alike.

As the Midland Cooperator points out, the bill would not be a cure-all for the Midwest dairymen. Many difficult problems will remain. Nevertheless the bill would be a step in the right direction.

The Agricultural Law Research Program at the University of North Dakota School of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, the School of Law of the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks has embarked upon a new program of agricultural law research.

Under the direction of Dean O. H. Thormodsgard, of the school of law, Prof. James P. White as director, and Richard H. Skjerven as research associate, have completed the first of their studies "A Survey of Laws Affecting Farm Tenancy in North Dakota."

With the cooperation of Prof. Laurel D. Loftsgard, of the Department of Agricultural Economics of North Dakota State University, as coordinator of this research at that institution and others, these gentlemen have conducted a very thorough study of the laws affecting farm tenancy. They are to be congratulated for the forward step they are taking in this field.

I am pleased to present to you the following excerpt from the North Dakota Law Review, volume 37, April 1961, which outlines this program:

[Reprinted from North Dakota Law Review, vol. 37, Apr. 1961]

THE AGRICULTURAL LAW RESEARCH PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA SCHOOL OF LAW

In the past several decades various law schools in the United States have become increasingly concerned with activities and concurrent legal problems resulting from their particularized environmental location. Consequently law schools located in areas of industrial development frequently accord specialized consideration to legal problems resulting from this industrialization,¹ while law schools in the Western States have undertaken research in mining law, oil and gas law, and water rights.² Law schools in urban areas have been increasingly occupied with various legal-economic-sociological aspects of urbanization.³ Thus also have law schools in agricultural areas become

occupied with problems of agricultural law.⁴ North Dakota is located in the most productive agricultural region of the United States. In contrast with the entire Nation, where only 6 percent of total income received by individuals originated in agriculture in 1958, the percentage of agricultural income in North Dakota in the same year was 38 percent.⁵ In the same year there was a greater unbalance in North Dakota between income from agriculture and income resulting from manufacturing.⁶ North Dakota has tremendous contemporary investment in farmlands and in farm equipment and machinery. Rising land values, greater mechanization of the farming operation, the cost of mechanization, the resulting growth in the average size of farms, and the increasing complexity of the farming operation have created many legal and policy matters about which the University of North Dakota School of Law as a State institution should be concerned and to which it should perform its best service. Service can be performed which will be of great value to members of the legal profession in North Dakota and to their farm clients. There are undoubtedly many aspects of the total farming operation which could be assisted by consultation with and enlightened advice by members of the legal profession.

The School of Law of the University of North Dakota has commenced a program of interdisciplinary research with the North Dakota State University which has for years served the farmers of North Dakota in matters of agricultural science. This program has been designated as the agricultural law research program and was commenced in the 1960-61 academic year. It is most apropos that the University of North Dakota through its school of law and the North Dakota State University through its department of agricultural economics cooperate in furthering legal research which will prove of benefit to agriculture. It is hoped that this program may render public service to the agricultural interests in this State by delineating, through research and writing, the methods in which existing laws may be utilized and new laws may be formulated to further agriculture. It is part of the constructive program of the law, in which legal planning and competent legal advice may prevent unnecessary difficulties and provide the way for more effective action.

Prof. James P. White of the School of Law of the University of North Dakota has been designated by Dean O. H. Thormodsgard as director of this program. Prof. Laurel D. Loftsgard of the Department of Agricultural Economics of North Dakota State University is coordinator of this research at that institution. During the current academic year, Mr. Richard H. Skjerven, a senior in the school of law, has served as research associate in the program at the University of North Dakota School of Law.

With the agricultural law research program established, it will be possible to obtain grants from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, The Farm Foundation, State governmental agencies, and charitable and educational foundations for special research in the agricultural field. Several projects have been completed in this agricultural research program. The study on North Dakota farm tenancy appearing in the current issue of the North Dakota Law Review is the latest study in this continuing program. Former projects completed under this program have been "Family Farming Incorporated,"⁷ by Laurel D. Loftsgard and H. W. Herblison; "Taxation of the Family Farm Corporation and Partnership: Variations on a Theme,"⁸ by James P. White and "Land Purchase Contracts in North Dakota,"⁹ by Shelley J.

Lashkowitz and Charles L. Crum. Other articles will be forthcoming.

Woodrow Wilson has suggested that "social service is the high law of duty, and every American university must square its standards by that law or lack of its national title."¹⁰ The Agricultural law research program at the University of North Dakota School of Law is a manifestation of the concept of public service by a university suggested by Woodrow Wilson, by its service to the people of North Dakota. The program envisages and is currently undertaking further cooperative-interdisciplinary studies in legal-economic research. Further areas of contemplated research and exploration exist in the areas of water law and water rights study, further study of farm corporations and farm partnerships, estate planning for the farmer, country rural zoning, fences, weed control, conservation and waste, farm trusts and others. These subjects might be explored and made more meaningful to the North Dakota lawyer and farmer. It is contemplated that during the 1961-62 academic year a legal institute will be held on the campus of the University of North Dakota discussing the relations of law and agriculture in North Dakota. Faculty and staff participants of the Agricultural Law Research program will be and are available as speakers, not only to bar associations but to all segments of the North Dakota State community.

Thus the new agricultural law research program at the University of North Dakota is twofold. The first and most important aspect is sound and basic legal research in the area of agricultural law. The second aspect of the program is public service based upon this research. Both of these functions will be accomplished as positive programs in assisting the progress of North Dakota.

¹ An example is the studies of labor-management arbitration at the University of Southern California School of Law. Studies in International Business Ventures at Columbia Law School and the Law-Economics Studies at the University of Chicago.

² An example are studies on oil and gas law at the Southwestern Legal Foundation at Southern Methodist University School of Law and the Water Research Institute and the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation at the University of Colorado.

³ As an example the Institute of Legal Research at the University of Pennsylvania has recently been studying the operations and legal status of the Philadelphia Tax Review Board and the Law-Medicine Research Institutes of Boston University's School of Law.

⁴ The College of Law at the State University of Iowa was the pioneer in this area of inter-disciplinary cooperation. (See 38 Iowa Law Review 10 (1952)). Programs of agricultural research have been instituted in the law schools at the Universities of Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Florida, and South Carolina.

⁵ "Survey of General Business" (August 1959), table 70 at 24. See also Koenker and Fisher, "Tax Equity in North Dakota" (1960), esp. pp. 2-12.

⁶ "Survey of General Business" Ibid.

⁷ Circular A-321 January 1960, North Dakota Agricultural College Extension Service, Fargo, N. Dak.

⁸ North Dakota Law Review 87 (1960).

⁹ 36 North Dakota Law Review 159 (1960), "This article was contributing study in a north central regional research project NC-15, financial support for which was provided by regional research funds."

¹⁰ Stannard and Dodd, "The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson" (6 vols., 1925-27), College and State I, at 457.

Governor Rockefeller's View of State Responsibility in Its Relationship With Its Own Citizens and With the Federal Government

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

**OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961**

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, recently the 38th Annual American Municipal Congress, sponsored by the American Municipal Association, met in Seattle, Wash., and was addressed by the distinguished Governor of the Empire State, Nelson A. Rockefeller. We in New York are justly proud of the administration and leadership which has been given to our State by Governor Rockefeller. Several examples of the Rockefeller administration's handling of State affairs are included in the Governor's speech and I am sure that his additional remarks concerning the role of State governments and their responsibility to the citizens of the State without constant recourse to Federal assistance will be of considerable interest to my colleagues.

I include the text of Governor Rockefeller's address:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT 38TH ANNUAL AMERICAN MUNICIPAL CONGRESS SPONSORED BY AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION, OLYMPIC HOTEL, SEATTLE, WASH., AUGUST 28, 1961

I am delighted that "Intergovernment Cooperation" is the theme of this conference. No subject could be closer to my heart as a Governor, no subject could be more important to the future growth and development of America.

Let me speak first of the elements of the Governor's relation to municipal government, for the matter to all the entities of local government within the State.

The basic requirement in this relationship is that the Governor and the State recognize and assume their full responsibilities. This requirement is of overriding importance, and it involves four principal elements:

1. Understanding, knowledge and respect for the structure of government and the basic concept of home rule—for the function and roles of the respective entities and levels of government.

2. Close cooperation between the Governor and the legislature to provide the legislative framework within which the municipalities and all forms of local government can function most effectively, and also to provide the special legislation needed to meet the wide variety of individual problems of local government.

3. Fiscal integrity on the part of State Government to insure a favorable climate for economic growth and to insure adequate financing for State services and State aid to localities.

4. State coordination and leadership in regional planning—in anticipating emerging problems and in fostering intergovernment cooperation which, as your conference theme indicates, is the key to the solution of these problems.

Now let us look at some of the major prob-

lems of concern to municipal government in which the State has an important share of the responsibility—finances, education, housing, youth delinquency, commuter transportation, recreation, sewage disposal and highways. If you will forgive me for stressing the problems of one State, I shall deal with these problems on the basis of my personal experiences in New York because I would rather speak in terms of specific action rather than in theories or broad generalities.

First, municipal finances—the vital and increasingly important role of the State in its financial relationship to municipalities is underscored in New York by these facts:

1. New York State aid to localities has increased 500 percent in the past 15 years—having increased from \$250 million in 1946 to 1 billion and a quarter dollars in the current fiscal year—a billion dollar increase.

2. State aid to localities is 600 percent greater than Federal aid to localities in New York State—contrary to popular impression.

3. State aid provides, on the average, about one-fourth of all municipal revenues.

In view of the important role that State aid plays in local government finances, the magnitude of its responsibilities to the municipalities is clearly evident. And it is basic to meeting this responsibility: that the State keep its own financial house in order so it can meet its full responsibilities, and that the formulas by which State aid is distributed shall reflect changing local conditions.

Therefore, my first act as Governor of New York was to restore the State's fiscal integrity on a basis of pay-as-you-go financing. With fiscal integrity restored, the result was that the State has been able (for instance) to increase State aid to local public schools by over a quarter of a billion dollars annually, in the past 3 years, out of current revenues.

Another important aspect of fiscal integrity is its effect on economic growth. Just as a fiscally irresponsible family or business cannot prosper, neither can a State or its communities prosper and grow in a climate of fiscal irresponsibility. Economic growth through business and industrial expansion is essential to provide increasing and improved job opportunities as well as sources of increased revenue to meet the demands of a growing population on all levels of government. Improvement of the business climate in New York State has been one of my major objectives, to overcome the problems of unemployment. However, this obviously cannot be accomplished by the State alone but requires the cooperation of all levels of government.

In addition, we have recognized that the time has come to take a fresh look at the State aid formulas themselves. Currently under study are the formulas for both State aid to elementary and secondary education and the amount and formula for per-capita State aid to municipalities.

Second, education—The quarter-billion-dollar increase in State aid to local public school districts brings our total school aid to \$800 million a year—more than the cost of the entire State government and its services.

New York State is now paying over 42 percent of the total local public school expenditures in the State.

The basic school aid equalization formula, based on local real estate values (and adopted when Al Smith was Governor) under today's conditions militates against the big cities—with their new and mounting difficulties. A special commission on school financing established by the legislature is therefore conducting a complete review of the formula and, is expected to present recommendations for revision of the legisla-

ture next January. The new formula will undoubtedly result in further increases in State aid to elementary and secondary education, particularly in the cities.

At the same time, the commission is also studying possible new sources of revenue for the local school districts, which are presently limited to local real property taxes. I am confident that State and local government, working together, can solve the school-financing problem on a basis of close cooperation, imagination and making hard decisions.

But there is another phase to the problem. The rise in elementary and secondary school enrollment in New York State is now moving on to the field of higher education and producing there a crisis in terms of adequate facilities. To meet this problem, we enacted this year a far-reaching plan for financial assistance to higher education which included: a new program of scholar incentive payments to approximately 120,000 individual students annually; doubling the number of State scholarships to a total of 17,000 annually; providing increased student loans with no interest for the first 5 years; 10-year expansion program of the State university facilities; and a half-billion dollar lease-purchase plan for the Campus Building Construction Authority.

The State's goal is to double higher education facilities (public and private) in the next 10 years, and to triple them in 25 years.

The resulting impact on the cities of this State of assistance to higher education is well illustrated by the fact that the State now puts up almost 45 percent of the expenses of the University of the City of New York. The City University provides free education for 97,000 students. In addition the State will also be directly helping an additional 50,000 students in New York City going to primarily private universities through scholarships and scholar incentive aid.

This clearly illustrates the magnitude of the State's role in meeting one of the major problems of our municipalities—namely, education.

And the State's role in education was further dramatically highlighted last Monday when we had to step in (with unprecedented action at a special session of the legislature) to lift the public school system in the city of New York out of the clutches of local corruption and politics and assure fresh, high-calibre leadership.

I called the special session of the legislature on behalf of the 1 million New York City public school children and their 40,000 dedicated teachers, upon the professional advice of the commissioner of education and the board of regents, in whose hands the State constitution places responsibility for education in the State. This action was made necessary by a failure of local leadership to do anything of significance in response to repeated disclosures of maladministration, graft, inefficiency, favoritism and atrocious neglect of school repairs. The public had lost confidence in school leadership, and the quality of instruction was threatened. Therefore, the State had to act.

The legislature passed a bill almost unanimously (only a total of seven dissenting votes in both houses) to supersede the existing school board; to create a permanent panel of distinguished educational, professional, and civic leaders to select nominees for new school board members from which the mayor will appoint the board members; to give the new board temporary emergency powers; and at the same time to end political appointment of the 53 local school boards within the city.

Now let me turn to the third area, housing. The problems of housing and urban renewal

are among the most urgent faced by all our municipalities.

In this field, middle-income housing is perhaps the most neglected area. Therefore, to help meet the financial aspect of this need headon, the State created last year a new State housing finance agency, with a bond authority of over half a billion dollars as a start. To date, 41 projects providing 17,400 apartments have been approved under the State's middle-income housing program. Mortgage commitments for these projects total \$195 million. And 10 percent of the apartments in each project are set aside to take care of our senior citizens. We are now developing some new ideas which we hope will greatly accelerate this middle-income housing program.

In the field of urban renewal (a vital ingredient in the development of better housing) New York State now pays half the local share of project costs—and does so on a pay-as-you-go basis out of current revenues.

In addition, while most States depend on the Federal Government entirely for loans and subsidies to provide low-income housing, New York State since 1939 has provided \$960 million in loan funds and \$42 million in annual subsidies for low-income housing, most of which has been used by the city of New York.

The State has an important obligation to help the localities in the housing field, and it is our feeling in New York that the State can act as a catalyst and coordinator in the realization of effective action in this field. The same is true for the urban renewal and low-rent housing programs. In my opinion, the Federal Government should modify its programs to recognize State administration wherever the machinery exists to handle such a delegation of authority. It certainly would be in the interest of efficiency and coordination of effort.

Fourth, youth delinquency. Here, again is a field of major concern to the administration and residents of our municipalities.

In New York State, to assist in meeting this problem, I requested and the legislature established a division for youth, which has undertaken a program embracing advanced concepts which we believe to offer exciting new possibilities not only for the rehabilitation of delinquents but for the prevention of delinquency.

Under this division for youth we are setting up youth training camps to which youths in danger of becoming delinquent because of environment may be referred by appropriate social agencies with family consent, and other camps to which juveniles may be referred by the courts for rehabilitation in lieu of sentencing to reform school. This program also includes a large number of State-operated short-term adolescent retraining centers, and homes for youth needing an improvement environment.

These new programs are in addition to the State's sharing in financial support of the care of juvenile delinquents in local facilities. The division for youth also provides State aid to localities for youth recreation and related projects.

Thus State expenditures to serve youth and combat juvenile delinquency have been stepped up sharply to \$24 million this year. We believe this work is of major importance to the future as well as essential to meeting the State responsibility in assisting municipalities with their share of this serious problem of delinquency. Further expansion of this program is contemplated.

And here, once again, we see the broad vistas for State leadership and participation in the handling of problems at the community level.

Fifth, commuter transportation—Here is a critical field of municipal concern, a problem the magnitude of which has been growing by leaps and bounds.

In New York, the State has taken the leadership in effective intergovernment cooperation both at the local and interstate levels:

1. At the 1959 session of the legislature, the State worked out and shared with the localities a program of general tax relief for the railroads amounting to \$15 million. Unfortunately, even this drastic action did not remove the threat of bankruptcy from two of our principal commuter roads.

2. Therefore, during the recent 1961 session, we had to take further action, working out cooperative steps with Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, the city of New York and the county of Westchester to reduce further the local tax and other financial burdens on the New Haven Railroad. While unfortunately this did not prevent the railroad's ultimate bankruptcy, it did create improved conditions for continuation of its commuter service under the present trusteeship.

3. In addition, within New York, we worked out a plan whereby the State picks up half of certain additional tax concessions by the localities, and the additional tax relief was made contingent upon improved as well as continued commuter service. To assist the railroads in meeting this stipulation, the State is backing a \$100 million Port of New York Authority bond issue to finance lease-purchase of new commuter cars by the railroads.

4. At the present time, I am working with the Governors of Connecticut and New Jersey to establish a tri-state agency to study the entire transportation picture in the New York metropolitan area—with the objective of regional action to achieve major improvement of the whole commuter situation.

And 2 weeks from today, I will be in Washington with the mayors of more than a dozen cities, testifying concerning railroad mergers which vitally affect the economic well-being of the State as a whole, its respective municipalities and the Port of New York in particular.

In this entire field of railroad transportation and commuter service, the State has provided initiative in seeking to meet squarely the growing crisis—which afflicts not only New York but metropolitan areas throughout the country.

Sixth, recreation: In municipalities throughout the Nation, parks and recreational facilities have become an essential ingredient for growth and development—not only for youth but for the entire community.

As in most States, the advance of urbanization is a major problem in New York with respect to assuring adequate park and outdoor recreation facilities for our rapidly growing population, now and for the future. We came to the conclusion that we must act rapidly if we were to acquire and preserve for public use the necessary sites for camping, boat landings, fishing, swimming, water sports, parks and other recreation facilities before they were swallowed up forever or could be obtained only at prohibitive costs.

Therefore, at my request last year, the legislature authorized a \$75 million program to purchase such areas. The bill provides State aid to localities for this purpose at a ratio of \$3 in State money for every \$1 provided locally. This anticipation of the future's needs has met with enthusiastic response from local communities throughout the State, even beyond our expectations. All but 15 percent of the funds has already been committed.

This, again, illustrates the possibilities for far-sighted cooperative action on the part of the State in working with municipalities and other entities of local government to meet new and emerging problems.

There are two other areas of concern to municipalities which entail tremendous financial obligations and vitally affect the lives of their people, namely, arterial highways and sewage disposal.

For example, in New York State the local communities are already faced with the prospect of identified expenditures totaling \$1.5 to \$2 billion for sewage disposal plants—and the meeting of these expenditures would in many instances involve exceeding the total debt limit of the municipality. At the present time, the State's office for local government is undertaking a major study as to the means of financing these requirements.

As far as arterial highways are concerned, the State is responsible for the engineering, construction, and a major portion of the financing of these roads—and these roads, probably more than any other single factor today, are shaping the future growth and development of most of our municipalities. The magnitude of these projects in terms of money can well be illustrated by the fact that the legislature has authorized arterial highway changes in connection with the 1964 New York World's Fair alone, which will cost a total of \$97 million, of which the State's share will be close to \$40 million.

Therefore, whether we like it or not, the State finds itself right in the middle of municipal and metropolitan area planning in all its phases relating to transportation, housing, industrial development.

It became clear to me 2 years ago that New York State was neither adequately equipped to coordinate the plans and programs of the various State departments affecting local governments or to integrate these State's plans and programs with those of the local communities. Therefore, to meet this urgent need, I set up in 1959 an office for local government and this year an office for regional development.

The office for local government has fostered joint action among local governments in solving mutual problems, served importantly as a clearinghouse for legislation affecting local government, and as a central point of information. It informs and assists the Governor as to local government problems and the formulation of policies to utilize and coordinate State resources for the benefit of local governments. It also conducts annual workshops on the problems of local government which have importantly stimulated thought and the interchange of information on solutions to these problems.

The new office for regional development, with the guidance of its planning coordination board made up of a commissioner from within the executive branch of State government, has these major functions:

1. To bring about a conscious interrelation of the planning and development activities of the various State agencies;
2. To relate state planning and development to local planning and development and to Federal activities;
3. To spur all levels of government within the State to comprehensive planning and development on a regional basis.
4. To facilitate local planning and development activity by State action.

To my way of thinking, the real challenge of the future in meeting the problems of the metropolitan areas is not to set up some super-structure that would wipe out existing entities of local government. Rather the challenge is to develop a legislative framework and the means for effective cooperation between existing entities of government, with the State assuming its full responsibilities for coordination and leadership as well as financial support.

My own experience of the last 3 years convinces me not only that this can be done but that it must be done if we are to meet our problems within the traditional American framework which holds to the belief that the best government is that government which is the closest to the people.

I am convinced that State government must take a stronger leadership role and is the logical leader of intergovernmental cooperation in the solution of urban and re-

gional problems. I support Federal assistance programs based upon need and the equalization of opportunities for all Americans in pursuit of national objectives. The important consideration in the relationship between the three major levels of government is that each level shall fully meet its own responsibilities and not pass them on to another.

We hear much these days about the decline of State and local government and the concentration of power in Washington. The best way to stop this decline is for those of us who are the heads of State and local government to have the courage to assume our full responsibilities. In New York, governments at all levels are working together in an effort to solve our own problems without constantly throwing up our hands and turning to Washington. Frankly, I think that's a pretty good objective for any State, or county, or municipality.

However, this does not mean that I am opposed to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs in the Federal Government. As a matter of better organization in Washington, it would make sense to coordinate scattered functions of the Federal Government related to urban problems. But it would be a tragedy if such a new department or agency were merely to become a handy instrument for the surrender of local responsibility, the bypassing of State government, or a substitute for courage and for making difficult decisions back home.

It is easy to ask for Federal money but it takes courage to raise adequate revenues at State and local levels to meet State and local responsibilities on an economical, pay-as-you-go basis. Those who really believe in home rule and who want to preserve local control have got to have the courage to raise a substantial share of the funds from local sources. Otherwise—let's not kid ourselves—the Federal Government will ultimately dictate the terms and conditions under which the programs shall be carried out.

We who have the privilege of serving in that Government which is closest to the people have a duty to meet their needs with efficiency, with courage, and with warm human understanding. But we must do so within a framework of fiscal integrity and local responsibility which a true concern for the best interests of the people demands.

It is a hard road—but it is the only road that will preserve the true vitality of democracy. It is the best road for the municipalities, the best road for the States, the best road for America.

Murfreesboro, Tenn., Dedicates New Post Office Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the speech which I was privileged to deliver at the dedication of the new post office building at Murfreesboro, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The remarks at this dedication ceremony follow:

MURFREESBORO, TENN., DEDICATES NEW POST OFFICE BUILDING

(Address by Hon. JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee)

Thank you Mr. Chairman, Postmaster Byrn, Mayor Todd, my colleagues Senators Kefauver and Gore, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and friends, it is a great pleasure to join with you in celebrating this occasion and to participate in this dedication ceremony.

Certainly, this is a banner day for Murfreesboro. I know it is a day you have looked forward to for a long time. It is a day that brings to realization a hope and a dream that the people of Murfreesboro and the surrounding communities have had for many years—the dedication of this splendid new post office building here in Murfreesboro.

On my visits here over the past years, and in communication with many of your citizens, I have been repeatedly made aware of the great need, interest and desire of the people for a new post office building to be built on a site close to the heart of your progressive community—for a facility which meets all of your present needs and is adequate to your present needs for many years of future development.

I commend and congratulate Postmaster Charlie Byrn, Mayor Todd, Judge Threet, and many others. In fact it seems most all of the citizens have made this project the No. 1 Federal project with the highest priority.

All are to be commended—all are to be congratulated.

The completion of this building is a fine example of your local enterprise and Federal Government participation and cooperation.

The fact that this building stands here at last is a tribute to your persistence. You have brought about this result by putting into practice a basic rule of achievement as it was once defined for me in memorable fashion by a great Tennessean, the late Judge Cordell Hull, whose memory we all cherish.

One day during my first term in the Congress, I was feeling a little impatient in my efforts to overcome some of the redtape that seems inevitably to clog the wheels in the vast machinery of our great Government. It was at this time that I took occasion to call upon and visit with Judge Hull, who had just retired as Secretary of State.

Judge Hull was most kindly and friendly and helpful, and he gave me some good pointers and sound advice. He stated that there were many qualities needed to become an effective Representative, but among the qualities most important he particularly stressed as absolutely necessary were the qualities of patience and perseverance.

"Be patient," he said, "and keep plugging for results."

I know today that this was about the best advice I ever received, and this new post office building in Murfreesboro is one more impressive confirmation of the wisdom and truth of Judge Hull's maxim on stick-to-it-iveness. Certainly it has taken a lot of patience and a lot of perseverance on the part of everyone concerned to bring this dream to realization.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

This building was erected under the Post Office Department's new commercial leasing program, whereby the Federal Government leases the facility from the private firm which holds possession of the grounds on which it stands and which contracted for the construction work.

This building is one of many presently being constructed throughout the country—as we are now moving forward in a greatly expanded Post Office modernization and re-

placement program. This marks an important advance for Murfreesboro to be provided with more adequate space, modern working conditions and better facilities to take care of the worsening mail resulting from growth of business and industry, generally, and the growth of our population in particular.

The commercial leasing program is the outgrowth of an experiment which started about 8 years ago, when the 83d Congress adopted a new method of handling the building of public buildings, and especially post offices, through what was then known as the lease-purchase plan. It provided that the buildings would be erected with private capital and funds, and the Federal Government would lease needed public buildings and pay for them over the years through the rental payments.

Disappointingly, that program never got underway or off the ground. After some 4 years, only two post offices were built under the Lease-Purchase Act and meanwhile all over the country more and more post offices were becoming outmoded and inefficient because of lack of space and lack of facilities to handle the increasing load expeditiously.

In 1954, I was honored by an election by my colleagues to membership on the Committee on Appropriations, which, as you know, appropriates the funds for all activities of our Federal Government. After our committee had looked into the operations of the lease-purchase program, it became obvious to Members of the Committee that this program was not working. Therefore, the committee moved to revert to our traditional system of building public buildings with appropriated funds. We had a pretty big fight about this in the committee and on the floor of the House, but in the end the House adopted our committee's recommended policy. The Senate went along and thus the Congress once again returned to our traditional policy of appropriating funds for the construction of public buildings where authorized and needed—and also to permit buildings being constructed under lease-purchase—either plan to get the needed job done.

Congress moved to put new life in the post office modernization and building program, by authorizing certain projects and appropriating the funds for them, but the Bureau of the Budget tied up the funds and refused to release the money so construction could be started.

I know we have all heard about Washington bureaucracy, but I can assure you that you do not know what bureaucracy is unless you have had some experience with Budget Bureau bureaucracy as developed particularly by the last administration. A small group of people in that Bureau operate as a type of supergovernment, trying to run the country according to their own ideas and often regardless of the policies established by Congress.

We have certainly had our difficulties—and our delays with a divided Government—a Democratic Congress and a Republican executive branch of the Government. Now we have a new administration—unified policies and we are moving forward.

Our new commercial leasing program, as it has been developed by the new administration, combined with the affirmative direction and efficient management seems to be the effective answer to the problem. Successful implementation of this program requires the constant and careful supervision by the Congress. Regardless of how much we improve our methods and techniques, we will always have to keep plugging away to get action on specific projects, which is only natural in an immense country such as ours where so many urgent tasks press for consideration all at once. We are mov-

ing ahead, but it takes perseverance and patience such as Murfreesboro has shown in bringing into being this splendid new post office building.

POST OFFICE SYMBOL OF TIE BETWEEN PEOPLE AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

There was a time many years ago when the postman was about the only Federal official or Federal employee that our local citizens knew or came in contact with. However, over the years, as we all know, there has been a great growth in Federal programs and Federal activities, and today the Post Office Building stands even stronger and more boldly as the link between people in the local community and the Federal Government—as a symbol of the strength of our great Federal Government.

Here will be housed the activities of the Post Office Department, including city delivery service, rural mail service, air mail service and all of the varied services and programs of the Post Office Department.

In addition, this building will serve as a center of information on matters of national defense, civil service, selective service, our county agricultural programs, and information on all other Federal activities is channeled directly through the post office.

Experience has demonstrated that our citizens want these services. No, my friends, our citizens do not want these programs curtailed or discontinued. They want service continued and expanded.

SYMBOL OF FAITH IN GROWTH OF A GREATER MURFREESBORO

We do not build fine new buildings such as this facility unless they are needed and unless the future of the city promises to justify the cost. So in meeting to dedicate this building we are also recognizing the growth of Murfreesboro and affirming our confidence and faith in this expanding community's future.

The Post Office Department, by providing this modern building with its many efficient facilities for handling the mail, evidences its confidence in the future of Murfreesboro. More than that, it has made a significant contribution to the further progress of this city—to Murfreesboro and Rutherford County.

This new postal facility will not only benefit the citizens of the community by providing better and more efficient postal service. The construction of this building has made the old post office building available for another public use.

As you know, I was pleased to work with the General Services Administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with city and county officials to see that the old post office building as surplus Federal property was turned over jointly to the city and county to be used for the Linebaugh Public Library. Thus the old postal facility—although inadequate for present required postal service needs—will continue to provide an important service to the community. It adds to your community establishment a facility that currently is valued at around \$90,000—well suited for a public library.

We are happy that both of these public improvements and services could be accomplished.

CONCLUSION—DEDICATION

So this new post office building stands as a symbol of service to our people. As we dedicate this building to the service of a greater Murfreesboro let it stand as a symbol of the Federal Government and strength of our country—a government which should be and is the servant of our citizens and not the master of our people.

As we dedicate this new post office to the service of the people of Murfreesboro and Rutherford County, it is well also that we rededicate ourselves to a spirit of unity of

purpose and to the determination to cooperate and work together in forwarding the great principles and ideals of our country that we may each contribute to making ourselves more useful in preserving liberty, justice, and democracy, and our cherished American way of life.

A Strange Policy That Muzzles Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the martyrdom of Gen. Edwin Walker may serve one useful purpose if it awakens the American people to the dangers inherent in administration policy which muzzles patriots while giving free rein to any critic of our free way of life. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune gives food for thought on the handling of truth by administration spokesmen:

VARIABLE TRUTH

Secretary of Defense McNamara admitted before the Senate Armed Services Committee that it had been the policy of the Kennedy administration to restrain military officers and Government officials from making strong anti-Communist statements. The gag was applied directly upon President Kennedy's inauguration. It was maintained through his meeting in Vienna with Khrushchev in June. It is still in effect as relates to utterances of military men.

Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, the principal opponent of this form of censorship, has compiled a representative selection of expressions and phrases stricken from proposed speeches by the Kennedy administration's censors on the ground that they might prove offensive to Communists.

It was taboo, for example, to say that "the Communist conspiracy was directed toward absolute domination of the world"; or that "Soviet infiltration is menacing this Nation and extending throughout the far corners of the globe"; or to refer to "the steady advance of communism," "the Communist challenge," or the "insidious ideology of world communism"; or to say that "socialism thrives" on Marxian theories, or that communism encompasses "Marxism, Fabian socialism, and socialism," etc., etc.

Mr. McNamara did not defend the suppression of such statements on the grounds that they were untrue; he defended their suppression because the administration considered it inexpedient to given utterance to them at a given time, or in certain circumstances. For instance, Mr. Kennedy was seeking the release of some American flyers held prisoner by the Soviet Union. Ergo, don't roll Moscow by calling a spade a spade. Or Mr. Kennedy was going to Vienna to see if Khrushchev wouldn't be reasonable about Berlin. So, until Khrushchev demonstrates that he is as unreasonable as always, don't stir him up.

McNamara's dissertation on the political elasticity of truth was offered in explanation of why Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker was removed from command of the 24th Division in Germany after he was accused of taking a hard anti-Communist line in a troop indoctrination program.

Lt. Gen. Frederic Brown, who was commissioned by the Pentagon to investigate

Walker, submitted, among other findings, this extraordinary judgment:

"General Walker is a sincere, deeply religious, patriotic soldier, dedicated to the Nation and to the Army. He is an eccentric and is not only violently anti-Communist but has been for years, working at it with a passion, studying, lecturing, and reading all literature available on the subject."

Therefore, it is "eccentric" to be anti-Communist, especially "violently" so, and to have been that way for years, and it is particularly eccentric to be anti-Communist on the basis of informed reading and study of the methods, tactics, strategy, and objectives of communism. And in the further opinion of General Brown, who happens to command the V Corps on the potential firing line against communism in Germany, it is some form of aberration that a commander who faced the ever present possibility that he would have to lead his division into action against Communists should have worked at his anticommunism "with a passion."

Well, perhaps this makes General Walker eccentric, but most of his countrymen will probably feel that the eccentricity lies with his critics in the Kennedy administration. When Khrushchev is waving around 100-megaton bombs and demanding surrender on pain of nuclear annihilation, is it eccentric to think that he and his imperialist system are menaces to the United States?

Apparently it was during the Kennedy moratorium on truth, in which the administration was governed by the doctrine that what is absolutely and eternally true is not necessarily true today, tomorrow, next week, or next month, though it may again be received as truth the month after that, depending on the administration's humor and Mr. Kennedy's latest purposes.

Peterson Adamantly Opposed to the Admission of Red China Into the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, to clarify my opposition to the admission of Red China into the United Nations, I wish to introduce into the RECORD an exchange of letters to the editor of the Ogden Standard Examiner between Mr. A. L. Petersen of 1485 Marilyn Drive, Ogden, Utah, and me, on this very important question. Mr. Petersen's original letter to the editor was based upon an article in the Ogden Standard Examiner wherein I stated that Red China would probably gain admission to the United Nations and that a program should be launched immediately to condition the U.S. mind to this possibility.

It was my privilege to again join my colleagues in the House on August 31 in overwhelmingly voting against diplomatic recognition by the U.S. Government of the regime of Communist China and against its admission to the United Nations. This is the second time Congress has been called upon for an expression of sentiment since I have been a Member of Congress, and the second time I have voted against the admission of Red China into the U.N.

The letters in question, as printed by the Ogden Standard Examiner, follow:

[From the Ogden Standard-Examiner, July 14, 1961]

ATTITUDE OF DEFEATISM

DEAR SIR: I read the interview of Representative M. BLAINE PETERSON, Democrat of Utah, in Monday evening's Standard-Examiner with more than a little displeasure. Since when do the minds of the U.S. people have to be conditioned to defeat—somehow this just doesn't seem right. It sounds as if we have "quitters" representing us in high places.

If the nations of the world are now viewing the admission of Red China more favorably, it would seem to throw more weight on a rather basic fact, that one does not buy true allegiance nor friendship. I wonder if our foreign aid hasn't been too heavy in goods and too light in information. Perhaps, instead of launching a program to condition the minds of the U.S. citizenry, our so-called "leaders" ought to launch a program to educate the minds of those who are succumbing to Communist propaganda.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. PETERSEN.

[From the Ogden Standard Examiner, Aug. 7, 1961]

MISUNDERSTANDING

EDITOR: Obviously a clear understanding of my reasons for opposing the admission of Red China to the United Nations is necessary as a result of the letter to the editor of Mr. A. L. Petersen, of 1485 Marilyn Drive, Ogden, based on your report of an interview when I was in Utah recently. I am glad to see Mr. Petersen's concern. Similar interest has also been expressed in letters directly to me.

I went on record as opposing the seating of Communist China in the United Nations shortly after I came to Congress when I signed the petition and become one of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. I would be proud to vote my conviction if I were a member of the United Nations, but, as you know, the only vote the United States will have on this important question will be cast by Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

In June of this year, Ambassador Stevenson discussed the China situation with us and, at that time, it was his judgment that we do not have the votes in the U.N. to prevent the seating of Red China in the General Assembly when they meet this fall. This was most certainly not an attitude of defeatism as such, but was an indication and expression of the Ambassador's deep concern based on a careful and continued study of this matter, plus his experience in foreign affairs over a period of many years.

Distasteful as the facts may be to those of us who are opposed to the seating of Red China, let us look at the record.

Last fall only 42 of the U.N.'s members voted for the moratorium to postpone the subject of the admission of Red China. Thirty-four nations were favorable toward consideration of the subject. Twenty-two nations abstained, but of these 22 it is important to note that they were, mostly from the newly independent African States. They were frank to state that their newness to the U.N. controlled their decision, but that they expected to vote to consider the China question this year. Proof of their intention is positive in that many of them have since declared themselves in favor of China's admission, the most recent example is to be found in the declaration for China's seating of Pakistan's President who just concluded a visit to this country.

A recent publication on U.N. affairs entitled "War/Peace Report" is reputed to have polled 96 of the 99 members on the China question. More than three-fourths, the report states, said Communist China should have a seat in both the General Assembly and in the Security Council. Unquestionably, this spells double-trouble for the United States.

The European countries are looking to the United States to make the first move. Should we act to extend the present moratorium, we can expect sure defeat and an immediate vote on whether Communist or Nationalist China has the proper credentials to sit. This could very possibly result in a twin China recognition. In other words, a dual China situation could possibly mean admission of Red China in the General Assembly and leave Nationalist China in the Security Council. Perhaps Red China and Russia are dealing these cards intentionally.

Marquis Childs, a journalist of national renown, recently made this a subject of his article in connection with the future responsibilities of Chester Bowles and, among other things, said this:

"The obscure outlines of another decision, still shrouded in top secrecy, is currently involved. That is whether to try to make any change in China policy in view of the fact that the United Nations General Assembly will almost certainly vote Red China into the U.N. in the fall.

"Should a 'two Chinas' policy be advanced by the United States? Should Outer Mongolia be recognized as a practical way of asserting independence of Chiang Kai-shek's veto over American policy? Should the American public be educated to the need for a change lest when the U.N. vote comes with a shock of surprise, it will lead to a perhaps irresistible demand to take this country out of the world organization?"

The reaction of Mr. Petersen to your report on our interview is healthy, and I hope more people will consider the seriousness of the decisions that are facing President Kennedy as our Commander in Chief and of the State Department.

I have long subscribed to the adage, "to be forewarned is to be forearmed," and I hope that this rather detailed explanation will foster additional concern and interest because we have a problem in the Red China situation that demands the combined intelligence, faith and prayer of every loyal American who shares my determination that the United Nations must not become Communist dominated.

Sincerely yours,

M. BLAINE PETERSON,
Member of Congress.

"Who Is Mr. America?"—Feature Article Appearing in the Bellflower (Calif.) Herald Enterprise, Thursday, September 7, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following appeared on the front, feature page of the Bellflower Herald Enterprise newspaper in the important city of Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif., on Thursday, September 7, 1961:

WHO IS MR. AMERICA?

(The following item is reprinted, without need for further comment, from the current Bellflower Kiwanis Club bulletin.)

Doc Wes Helzer, member of the public and business affairs committee, is offering this statement to our membership:

"Arsonists caught in the act of burning down a building are prosecuted by law and punished.

"The Communists have, and are in the act of overthrowing our system of Government, and destroying all that you and I stand for.

"We are now outlawing this Communist party, in the State of California, with State bill No. 1263, and after 30 years it's about time.

"When will Mr. America display some of the intestinal fortitude that he inherited from his colonial and frontier forefathers?"

"You, sir, and I, are Mr. America."

Negotiations With Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Gen. Mark W. Clark, president of the Military College of South Carolina, is worthy of consideration by Congress and all leaders of our country during this Berlin crisis. This splendid article appeared in the Washington Evening Star, September 13, 1961:

CLARK URGES FIRMNESS IN DEALING WITH REDS

(By Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army, retired)

(The author, formerly U.S. high commissioner in Austria, and later commander of all United States and United Nations forces during the Korean conflict, has first-hand experience in dealing with Soviet-manufactured "Berlin-type" crises. General Clark now is president of the Citadel, a South Carolina military college.)

CHARLESTON, S.C., September 13.—My country has given me many opportunities to observe the Communists firsthand.

While I commanded the 5th Army in Italy during World War II, a group of Russian officer observers was attached to my staff. Their political adviser was Andrei Vishinsky, who organized Communist activities in areas that our forces liberated.

At the end of the war, as U.S. high commissioner in Austria for 2 years, I negotiated with Marshal I. S. Konev, the Soviet high commissioner, who recently has been placed in command of the Soviet armies in East Germany.

In 1947 I faced Communist negotiators across the conference table in London where I served as Deputy to the U.S. Secretary of State, and in the same capacity I sat in the Moscow Council of Foreign Ministers in 1947 with Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State.

Later on during the Korean conflict, when I was commander in chief, Far East and United Nations Commands, I came to grips with Communist tactics at Panmunjom during negotiations which led to the military armistice agreement for Korea which I finally signed on July 27, 1953.

USED SAME TACTICS

I found the Communists used the same obstructionist tactics everywhere I encountered them.

In Austria, all communications lines from Vienna to the American zone were through corridors set up and controlled by the Russians and agreed to by the Allied governments. The corridors passed through 110 miles of Russian-occupied territory. There was one corridor by air, one by road, and one by rail.

The situation was identical to the present one in Berlin.

The air corridor was narrow between Vienna and our sector. Russian warplanes began crowding us inside this corridor. Sometimes they fired on our planes, and one, a Russian warplane, fired on the airplane in which I was flying. When I found protests to Marshal Konev to be futile, I ordered American planes flying the corridor to be armed, and ordered our airmen to fire on any Russian plane that made a menacing move inside the corridor. I so informed Marshal Konev in writing. Never again did the Russians challenge us inside that corridor.

We had something of the same problem with trains. The Russians often halted our train, the "Mozart Express," when it went through their zone between our headquarters in Vienna and our zone in Salzburg.

I followed the usual pattern of repeated protests to Marshal Konev, and as usual he took no action. Finally, he was warned formally that our military police had been ordered to keep Russian soldiers off our train.

Shortly thereafter several Red army officers and enlisted men forced their way aboard the train. As a result, T. Sgt. Shirley B. Dixon of our military police shot one Russian officer dead and wounded another who tried to draw his gun.

The Russians violently protested the shooting, but the interruptions in our train service ceased.

These and many similar experiences I had with Communists around the world demonstrated to me the necessity of using unmistakable determination when dealing with representatives of the Kremlin.

An incident involving Danube River barges illustrates, however, that we did not always follow this policy. Shortly after our arrival in Austria, the Russians stopped all shipping on the Danube. About that time I found that all Austrian, Yugoslav-Hungarian, and other river barges had been moved up to Linz by the Germans in the closing days of the war. Therefore, they were in the American zone.

BOUNDARY EXTENDED

The Russians persuaded Washington to extend their boundary to the Danube in the Linz area; so I moved the barges farther up river to the American zone of Germany for safekeeping. I sensed that they would be an ace up our sleeve in bargaining with the Communists because barges would be essential when river traffic was resumed.

The Communists almost immediately pressured us to return the barges. On a trip back to Washington, I discussed the barges and gained the impression that everyone concerned, including President Truman, agreed that we should hold them. At a conference with me President Truman said, "Mark, I heartily agree with you. You hang on to those barges."

Upon my return to Vienna, however, I received a message from the State Department, instructing me to return the Yugoslav barges. I replied that I was under the distinct impression that I had approval for holding the barges as a bargaining point. The Secretary of State said to turn the barges over to the Yugoslavs. I turned them over.

MANY SIMILAR INCIDENTS

There have been many similar incidents in our dealings with the Communists. They demonstrate that strength and determination are two things Communists respect and, skillfully applied, will prevent communism

from achieving its goal of world domination that today threatens free people everywhere.

Fortunately, there seems to be a refreshing awakening to this fact. This is indicated by strengthening our military posture, and by the firm stand that President Kennedy has taken on the Berlin issue. His reinforcing our Berlin garrison and his forthright statement concerning the consequences of interfering with free allied access to Berlin are the kinds of actions the Russians understand.

His sending Vice President Johnson and Gen. Lucius D. Clay to bolster the morale of the West Germans and demonstrate our vested interest in Berlin was also the kind of action that will not be lost on the Communists.

It is my hope that this approach signals that America has awakened and that our country will pursue a courageous policy for firmness. Without such a policy we can never effectively negotiate with the Communists.

Marshal Konev once revealed their frustrating negotiating technique to me at a party in Vienna. After he had a couple of drinks of vodka, I asked him what would happen if the following morning I accepted all the preposterous Soviet demands then under discussion.

He laughed and said he would have 10 new ones to submit to me the next day.

In the face of such truculence, the free world must remain steadfast.

Let us have peace in our time, but not at the price of Communist slavery for ensuing generations.

A Creed for American Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include one of the finest pieces of writing it has been my privilege to see in some time. A "Creed for American Leadership" was written as a letter to the editor of the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner by David McQuiddy, Jr., and reprinted in the Cody (Wyo.) Enterprise.

A CREED FOR AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

(We reprint below a creed for American leadership, expressed by David McQuiddy, Jr., in a letter to the editor of the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner:)

"I am an American. I fear God, but because I am free, I fear no man. I am dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal in the eyes of God and the law, but in nothing else. I ask only to be left alone, unhindered by bureaucratic limitations, to develop my God-given talents to their highest degree. I am content with only my best efforts, deploring mediocrity in myself and others. I accept personal responsibility for my decisions and for my provision. I neither want nor expect others to think or provide for me. I desire to be rewarded in accordance with my ability—not my needs—believing that that which is earned ennobles and that which is given enslaves. I expect to earn my own way, paying my just debts, but not the debts of others. I work to provide for myself and those I love, but for none else except by my own choosing. It is my right to keep that which I have earned and to dispense it as my own conscience dictates.

"I prize my own self-respect above all things, preferring it to slavish conformity and the plaudits of the mob. I believe there is a distinction between intolerance and an honest indifference of opinion. I honor those with whom I disagree when I know them to be honest and sincere in their beliefs, but I reserve the right to take issue—both publicly and privately—with all whom I believe to be in error—I would go the extra mile to help him who would help himself, but I want no part of him who would live by the sweat of others.

"I believe that America represents the last best hope of mankind to live in freedom and individual dignity. I am willing to defend with my life the principles of our Constitutional Republic against those who would destroy us from without, but I am conscious that history has dramatically proven that more citadels crumble from within than are taken by siege or assault.

"The call to battle has sounded, the lines are drawn, and the hour grows late. An aroused citizenry must rededicate itself upon the altar of self-sacrifice to restore that sense of patriotism, moral courage, and individual initiative which has served us so well in the past. As a mass dedicated to mediocrity and peace at any price, we are doomed. As free-men, glorying in our individuality and sustained by a firm faith in ourselves and our God, we are united in the only true way.

"I am an American. You are an American. Let us be Americans together."

Addresses of Vincent P. Hoparco, Outgoing National Commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., at the 26th Annual Convention of the Organization in Utica, N.Y., on August 25 and 26, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of two outstanding addresses delivered at the 26th Annual Convention of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., in Utica, N.Y., recently by the outgoing National Commander of that great organization, Vincent P. Hoparco, of Syracuse. The first address was delivered at the session on August 25, and the second at the banquet on August 26.

My dear friends, since 1776, we, our country, that is, have been faced with many crisis and dilemmas. They were met and, ultimately, victory was ours. Today, we are challenged by a much more cunning, powerful, and conniving adversary than ever before. Deception in its worse form has been thrust at us, and the other countries of the free world, by a glib tongue from which flows an everlasting stream of lies. Premier Khrushchev is a supreme master in this field. In fact, so much so, that the gap between him and his nearest rival, Fidel Castro, is likened to the distance to the Moon. Khrushchev, this man of many and varied moods, hold the balance of war in his fat palms. He knows it, and so does everyone else in the world.

You can imagine what a stunning blow was dealt to the ego of this warmonger,

when President Kennedy announced to Russia and the world, on that memorable evening of July 25, that we had gone far enough. Our President laid it squarely on the line. Without a doubt, the Soviets were made to understand, quite clearly, the position of the United States. Two definite and clearcut statements were, "we do not want to fight—but we have fought before," and "we seek peace—but we shall not surrender."

The leaders of both parties have acclaimed the remarks of the President. Also, our allies had words of praise for this straightforward attack toward a possibility of Russia swallowing another portion of the world without any objection.

We have been undergoing some embarrassing diplomatic fumbles in Africa, Laos and, of course, that thorn in our side, Cuba. The time had to come when we, as the greatest nation in the world, and the strongest advocate for peace for all people in the universe, had to draw that line in the dirt. Do you recall as a youngster, how two boys would have some words? One boy would bend over and draw a line in the dirt, and challenge the other to cross the line. Childish? Not today it isn't. Especially with the nuclear instruments of death and destruction in the possession of Soviet Russia and the allies. The Russians know where we stand now, and repercussions are coming from East Germany. Communist newspapers disclose a fear of war by the East Germans and they are blaming the Soviet Union for the situation. The flow of refugees to West Berlin give proof of the unrest caused in East Germany by Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's threat to sign a peace treaty that will end Western rights in Berlin. If the people of East Germany continue to show disapproval to this possibility of bloodshed of Germans, the blackmail attempt of the Communists would have failed.

Now the Russians have introduced another form of strategy. A barricade has been erected at the Berlin border by order of Khrushchev. Why? Could it have been to stop the obvious discontentment of East Germans with Communist rule? Also, could it have been to halt the ever increasing bad example, from his point of view, on his other satellites—Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia? Would you say then that people flee from a happy, contented life? Of course not. When people leave their homes, loved ones and their jobs, they act in desperation to escape domination of will for something better—freedom. Khrushchev speaks of "Soviet grandeur", but yet, thousands have risked death to escape this glorious life. Even to the point of East German soldiers crossing over the barrier. How red faced can Khrushchev get? If that is possible?

We, as veterans, are very familiar with this shadow beclouding the horizon, since not too long ago, a somewhat similar atmosphere enveloped the world. I wish to impress upon you one reason, and the strongest, in my way of thinking, for supporting the President's action toward Berlin.

Many of us, either, have boys who are of draft age, or in their teens. Visualize, if you will, the outcome of their future if President Kennedy had not declared this solid front of determination to uphold the mandate of the peace treaty after World War II, relative to the responsibility allocated to Great Britain, France and the United States in overseeing the welfare of the citizens of West Berlin. Instead of being called into service to increase our manpower strength, they would be called to be sent overseas as reinforcements for a shooting star. Khrushchev cannot risk entering into battle for fear of repercussions in his own country. Do you thing for one moment that the Russian people would risk the ravages of a nuclear bombardment of their homeland and the slaughter of their countrymen just to ac-

quire the other half of a German city, which could develop into a Trojan horse? They are a free people in West Berlin—not slaves of the Russian Communists—and they intend staying that way.

Consider another dangerous possibility which confronts Russia. Communist China, at one time, was a protégé of Russia. Today, many are wondering just how fearful Russia is of China. Chinese Communist Chairman Mao Tse-tung and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev plainly do not see eye to eye since Mao's attempt to overshadow Nikita, with his threats to the Western Allies, and, anyone else in general, who have opposed China's overrunning of that harmless country of Tibet. Then, too, their failure to be recognized by the United Nations. Don't think for one moment that Khrushchev hasn't considered the fact that in the event of a shooting war with the free world, China might enter the picture by attacking Russia from the back door. What basis can we have of this? Only this—China places herself as an equal with the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and France. Now then, thinking along these lines, what would become of her if Russia did start a shooting war and accomplished her aim of conquering the free world? She would be next. Therefore, if she helped us down Russia, we would not attack her, ever, and thus leave her to herself. Not so—Russia. Of course, the great statesmen of our country and our allies have other reasons to add. The more, the merrier, thus insuring a peaceful coexistence with strictly a cold war—nothing else. But, the world knows that the decision to fight or back down rests on Khrushchev's shoulders. Therefore, we and our allies, must stand firm in Berlin.

In closing, let me say that if we appreciate living in this wonderful and great country of ours, support the President, whether it be Kennedy, now, or, future Presidents, in times such as these, and always. We know what we have—let us not lose this freedom of ours.

My dear friends, the headlines of our newspapers focus our sight and thinking to the West Berlin situation. A situation where a freedom-loving people wish to remain free, opposing a tyrannical and totalitarian system of government in which the word freedom has been stricken from its vocabulary. A decision was made by our President, John F. Kennedy, to hold the line in West Berlin. Apparently, it must have been the proper one, since all the leaders of the free world, together with the leaders of our own major political parties, have acclaimed this action. This was a resounding blow to Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, and, it was totally unexpected. The tentacles of Communist control are stretching out to embrace this community, but President Kennedy's stinging thrust has caused consternation in the Russian Kremlin. Premier Khrushchev's hot and cold behavior following this climactic announcement, showed evidence of the deep concern he had of our President's charges and declaration. His latest action of blocking the Berlin border strongly indicates a restless thinking, on his part. As in chess, the next move is his.

Grave concern is ours in West Berlin, but, what interest do the people of these United States have relative to the rising problems right here on our doorstep? The Monroe Doctrine, in over a century, has withstood all types of infiltration of the boundaries of the Western Hemisphere. We can see, however, that a toe has been inserted into an opening, holding the door ajar. You say, "Oh, you must be talking about Cuba? We've been keeping our eyes on Castro and he's simmered down a bit." My answer is that we had better take stock of ourselves and see if we are like the herdsman who

was protecting the herd of sheep, only he was blind in one eye and could not see out of the other. Let us wake up, my friends, Cuba, only 90 short miles away from our Florida shores, is a much more serious threat to our way of life than you are making yourselves believe. What would you say if I told you that Cuba is erecting missile launching stations at this very moment? Would you believe this to be true? Well, you had better believe it.

The Soviet scientists, engineers, and technicians, in Cuba now, are not there to improve their health, or on an extended vacation from Russia. They mean business.

If this weren't enough to give us cause for concern, the spread of that infectious disease, communism, is spreading to South America, danger zones are developing in British Guiana, Brazil, and Venezuela, British Guiana, for example, has gone the way of Cuba, and Fidel Castro, at its general elections on August 21. A Hindu dentist, Dr. Cheddi B. Jagan, educated in the United States, was elected prime minister. An interesting, and disheartening, fact here, is that Jagan's wife, the former Janet Rosenberg, is Chicago born, and a Communist. He married her in 1943, while still a student, and promptly was converted to communism, since she was a member of the Young Communist League in Chicago. They are very friendly with Castro. In fact, Castro contributed \$4 million toward the election and another conquest for communism.

In Brazil, the new president, Janio Quadros, seems to be leaning toward communism since his declaration of renewing relations with the Soviet Union to boost Brazil's trade. Also, he intends to establish contacts with Red China. Would you call this action as another form on an alert to the "handwriting on the wall" as concerns the western hemisphere?

The picture is slightly different in Venezuela. Here, turmoil exists within its own Government through economical and political problems. From the economical troubles stems an apparent upheaval of political stability. The Democratic government of President Romulo Betancourt has evaded disaster through some shrewd political maneuvering. A shift in governments would place the powerful Communist Party in power.

Need I state what would happen again? Apparently, the main problem facing Brazil and Venezuela is economic. Assistance from the United States through the foreign aid program would minimize this Red infiltration of our neighboring countries of South America.

Let us awaken to the danger of this nearness of communism to our shores.

Let us inform our Government of our concern to keep the Americans free.

Let us drive this menace back to where it came from—Russia.

In other words—it's getting too close for comfort. Contact your Representatives in Congress, expressing your views, to halt this danger before it is too late. Act now.

Mrs. Pauline Vann Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein articles from the Washington

Post, the Washington Daily News, the Selma Times Journal, and the Evening Star about the death of our beloved, mutual dear friend, Mrs. Pauline Vann Byrd. Mr. Speaker, this article speaks for itself up to a certain point, but there is no newspaper or anyone else that could tell the world about the wonderful things that this fabulous, wonderful woman has done for all mankind down through the years.

Mr. Speaker, Pauline Byrd has not been here as long as you, and of course, nobody has. But I want to tell you, she has been here over a quarter of a century. Thirty long years, Mr. Speaker. Everyone that has even known Pauline Byrd here, back home or over in Virginia, or down in Louisiana, or anywhere, and especially here in the Capital of the United States, just loved and respected Pauline Byrd for the great work she did for all mankind.

You will notice in this article that Pauline Byrd was the first woman president of the Alabama society. Mr. Speaker, she has practically always been president of the Alabama society. She looked after us just like a mother and father look after their children. At our congressional receptions, she would just take charge when we would go down to the ballroom to meet and greet our wonderful constituents from all over Alabama and many other States. She would put us in line, and would tell us how and what to do. She pinned the orchids on all of our wives and visiting ladies and on every Governor's wife from Alabama, ever since I could remember. She was just everywhere and she was so sincere. She was a great church member and she helped there. There was nothing that she could not do just a little bit better than most anyone else. She tried so hard to help us, and she certainly did help us.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Ocllo, reminded me the morning that Pauline went to heaven of something. Of course, I had never forgotten it either. But, when we lost our beloved son, Frank, Jr., Pauline Byrd was here. We lost our son back home in Alabama. She drove 900 miles, nearly 2,000 miles going and coming, to be there to help comfort my wife. That is the sort of person Pauline Byrd was.

Well, I want to tell you Mr. Speaker, as this article says, she was with the Social Security Administration in Birmingham and she did a good job there. I have had letters, not one, but hundreds of them, telling us about how she helped down there. I also have hundreds of letters from veterans, as she joined the Veterans' Administration as congressional liaison officer and worked in this position from 1945 until 1958. She was a widow of a great lumber executive, E. Roy Byrd, who was killed by Nicaraguan rebels in 1928.

Last but not least, she reared her daughter, beautiful Betty Byrd. I remember the wonderful wedding. I gave Betty away to one of the finest men I have ever known, the Reverend Edward E. Tate, of Virginia, who has a church now in Dallas, Tex., but who will go to

Atlanta, Ga. That is a little bit nearer to our State of Alabama. Pauline belonged to the Alexandria Women's Club and to Immanuel-on-the-Hill Episcopal Church there in Alexandria, Va. She lived on Wellington Road.

Mr. Speaker, when we went out to the beautiful church where her daughter was married and where her husband was the pastor, there they all were. I saw people that I haven't seen since Betty Byrd married Ed Tate a long, long time ago. Some of these friends flew from not only down in Montgomery, Ala., the Capitol of our great State where Jeff Davis was born, but they flew from North Carolina, Louisiana, Texas, and just all over. It was a great gathering. But, I did not sorrow for this wonderful person who went right direct to Heaven because I know Pauline Byrd will not have the troubles that the rest of us will have, as she had been good all of her born days. She was a thoroughbred here and I wish I could remember a poem that goes something like this, "If you will be a thoroughbred here, you will be a thoroughbred there." Pauline was a thoroughbred here, and I wish I had the remarks of our Senators and our nine Representatives. Every one of them was at this funeral we had Wednesday with the exception of the ones that were out of the city. We all loved Pauline Byrd.

We are having a wedding in our family. One of our granddaughters is getting married down in Mobile, Ala., next month. Pauline Byrd who helped look after Ocllo Boykin Smith since she was the Cherry Blossom Princess, meant a great deal to Ocllo Smith. Ocllo and her mother, Frances Boykin Smith, were crying over the telephone to us last night.

Well, I do not know how I am going to get along without the help of this great woman, but you and I know this Mr. Speaker, God does not take us home until we have finished the work here on earth that he has given us to do. Well, we have a lot that Pauline Byrd could do, but she has done her share and she has gone to her reward, and we will all be seeing her sooner or later. But, all of us will miss her very, very much. I know you will remember Pauline Byrd and will say with all of us, God bless Pauline Byrd, and her loved ones that she has left behind. Not only her daughter Betty and her son-in-law Ed, but the two beautiful grandchildren and I know God will take care of them until they, with us, join Pauline Byrd up yonder.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 30, 1961]

PAULINE BYRD

Services for Pauline V. Byrd, of 3208 Wellington Road, Alexandria, Va., widow of E. Roy Byrd, a lumber executive who was killed by Nicaraguan rebels in 1928, were to be held at 11 a.m. today in the Immanuel Church-on-the-hill in Alexandria. Mrs. Byrd worked with Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, of Alabama, from 1958 until her retirement this year. Earlier she had worked as a congressional liaison officer in the Veterans' Administration. She died Sunday.

[From the Selma Times Herald, Aug. 30, 1961]

MRS. BYRD PASSES

WASHINGTON.—Mrs. Pauline Vann Byrd, the first woman president of the Alabama State Society around 1950, died here Monday after a heart attack.

Mrs. Byrd, formerly of Monroeville, Ala., had worked here for many years. She retired some time ago from the Veterans' Administration and had worked for a while for Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, of Alabama.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 30, 1961]

MRS. BYRD, ONCE AID OF REPRESENTATIVE BOYKIN

Pauline V. Byrd, a retired member of the staff of Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, of Alabama, who worked in several Government agencies, died Sunday at George Washington University Hospital after a heart attack.

Mrs. Byrd worked with Representative BOYKIN from 1958 until her retirement this year. She was a native of Alabama and the first woman president of the Alabama State Society here.

Mrs. Byrd first came here in 1933, when she began working for the Department of Agriculture. She returned to Alabama in 1938 as an office manager for the Social Security Administration in Birmingham.

In 1945 she joined the Veterans' Administration here as a congressional liaison officer and worked in that position until 1958.

She was the widow of E. Roy Byrd, a lumber executive who was killed by Nicaraguan rebels in 1928.

Mrs. Byrd belonged to the Alexandria, Va., Women's Club and Immanuel Church-on-the-Hill, Episcopal. She lived at 3208 Wellington Road, Alexandria.

Surviving is a daughter, Mrs. Edward E. Tate, of Dallas.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 30, 1961]

MRS. PAULINE BYRD, SERVED UNITED STATES IN SEVERAL POSTS

Mrs. Pauline Vann Byrd, a Federal employee for 25 years, died Monday at George Washington University Hospital after a heart attack.

A native of Monroe County, Ala., Mrs. Byrd came to Washington in 1934 to work for the Agriculture Department. She later returned to Birmingham to serve as district manager for the Social Security Administration there.

She also worked as congressional liaison for the Veterans' Administration here, retiring 2 years ago. Mrs. Byrd also had been on the staff of Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, of Alabama.

She was the first woman president of the Alabama State Society and a member of the Secretaries Club on Capitol Hill. She belonged to Immanuel-Church-on-the-Hill, Alexandria, and was active in the altar guild there. She lived at 3208 Wellington Road, Alexandria.

Her husband, Roy E. Byrd, died some years ago.

She leaves a daughter, Mrs. Edward E. Pate of Dallas, Tex., and two grandchildren.

Services were scheduled for 11 a.m., today at Immanuel-Church-on-the-Hill, 3806 Seminary Road, Alexandria, with burial in Kentwood, La.

The family requests that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to Immanuel-Church-on-the-Hill or the Heart Fund.

Timely Warning to Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune is a forthright statement of the position of the free world. Let us hope there will be no second thoughts by the administration, as has been true in the past, and that we will not retreat from a policy of firmness and strength in the face of Communist aggression and blackmail. Any sign of appeasement or apparent weakness will only invite disaster. Let us hope that Khrushchev clearly understands the American will to resist the Communist conspiracy for enslavement of the world and will not load the camels back with the final straw.

The editorial follows:

THE CAMEL'S BACK

The U.S. Government, in two new and solemn warnings, has given notice to Khrushchev that any interference with Western allied rights in Berlin will result in war, and that in all likelihood war will bring recourse to thermonuclear weapons. Britain and France have joined in the warning. There should be no doubt in Khrushchev's mind that the West has yielded all that it will.

Notice has been given Moscow in a well-reasoned and well-written joint notes on rights through the Berlin air corridors. This document is scarcely concerned with diplomatic niceties. It discusses Khrushchev's resort to upside-down propaganda language with cold finality. It dismisses with contempt his contention that everything will be changed as soon as he signs a one-sided peace treaty with his creatures of the East German Communist puppet regime.

The second warning is even more direct. It was voiced by Paul A. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, in an address before the Association of the U.S. Army, an unofficial organization of officers, in Washington.

Nitze said three things. He said, first, that "there eventually comes a point where one more straw will break the camel's back of [American] forbearance. Any interference with our essential rights in Berlin must be viewed as the straw that breaks the camel's back."

He said, second, that the American buildup of conventional forces will make "more credible to the U.S.S.R. the certain prospect that we will back our nonnuclear forces by use of our strategic capabilities should that be necessary." In other words, the Russians must expect that nuclear strategic weapons will be used if they start a war.

Nitze said, third, that any interference at Berlin would bring retaliation not necessarily confined to that local sector of operations but on "terms other than those selected by the Soviets." This was interpreted as a threat of action on a far broader scale than that of the doctrine of "massive retaliation" to aggression at places and timing of western choice—a doctrine dating from the period of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

"Soviet tanks across the autobahn to Berlin," said Nitze, "would interpose at only one of the many points throughout the world where the important or vital interests of the Soviet empire are vulnerable."

The warning could hardly be clearer, and it is reinforced by the concluding passage in the joint note on the air corridors, for the

United States therein states that it "wishes to repeat in the most solemn terms the warnings already given" in two previous declarations dealing with the threat of Soviet interference with flights to West Berlin.

The note offers a reminder that there is today free and peaceful movement of persons and goods by air between West Germany and West Berlin, but that "any change in this situation will be the result of aggressive action against established rights by the Soviet Government, and the East German regime." Aggression, it is plain, will be met with retaliation.

If Khrushchev chooses to load the last straw upon the camel's back, he had better give thought to whose camel is going to collapse. It is the confidence of the United States and its allies that it will not be theirs.

The Serious Condition of Our Nation's
Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with the serious condition of our Nation's railroads, and with the need for constructive legislation to remedy that condition. In that connection I have proposed legislation to help the railroads by granting them a measure of tax relief. My bill, favorably reported on by the Interstate Commerce Commission, is still pending before the great committee on Ways and Means of this House.

Recently I was much impressed with an article that I read in the Christian Science Monitor analyzing in some detail the problems which our railroads face, especially those in the great eastern section of our country, and proposing some concrete recommendations for alleviating them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the Christian Science Monitor:

FILLING THE EMPTY SEATS—AMERICA'S HUGE
TRANSPORT NETWORK NEEDS TO BE SENSIBLY
CONDENSED, WITH ITS BASIC COMPETITIVENESS PRESERVED

The greatest single transportation system in the world appears to be headed for trouble in several departments in a way that might be called typically American.

It is suffering from too much capacity.

It is unbalanced by too much fragmented competition.

It is partially frozen by the very government regulation that was expected to keep it from becoming rigid under monopoly ownership—private or government.

Despite the fact that the heavily used New Haven Railroad is now bankrupt, that busy Capital Airlines was consumed by deficits, that standing-room-only commuter travel is encountering discontinuances, that common-carrier trucks are being challenged by producer-owned trucks, and that the eastern railroads are in a gigantic battle to preserve their skins through mergers, the situation does not yet amount to a crisis. The Kennedy administration was probably wise to defer sending Congress its "transportation crisis" message this year.

But the lawmakers should be preparing to take action next session. For much pub-

lic and private money, as well as travelers' and shippers' anguish, can be saved by moving ahead of crisis conditions.

The automobile is responsible for a good part of America's transportation overcapacity. While trains once carried some 83 percent of all passenger traffic, the individual car now carries 88 percent. And with an average of less than two persons per six-passenger car.

RAILROAD DEFICITS; MISSING PASSENGERS

Today, Government provides rights-of-way for air, water, and road travel—three of the four major transport systems. The result is a rush of buses, trucks, barges, and planes to use the Government-built "tracks."

But railroads have shrunk little in carrying capacity. So seats—and boxcars—are often empty.

Between 1946 and 1957 the passenger deficit of U.S. rail lines increased from \$139,776,000 to \$723,670,000. Only liberalized Federal regulation permitting abandonment of little used lines has let this drop back to \$485 million in 1960—still far too much red ink for the financial health of lines needing money for new equipment and better service.

It is estimated, furthermore, that freight operations are so far below capacity that an additional 75 percent could be handled.

Buses, which have been generally holding their own, have also had to contend with an uneconomic increase in empty seats.

Even the bustling, expanding airlines suffer from this problem. There has been an increase in empty-seat-miles flown from 1,580,000 in 1946 to 16,642,000 in 1959.

For years some rail lines were able to keep their net income steady by deferring maintenance and replacement of equipment. But the chickens have begun to come home to roost.

FRANCHISE FOR THE VICIOUS CIRCLE ROUTE

In the Doyle transportation study group's comprehensive report to the Senate Commerce Committee this year note is made of how this process has become a vicious circle. With less freight traffic, the railroads have condensed service. Trains are then run on a tonnage basis rather than a schedule. They are longer. Yards cannot handle them easily. Delays increase. Business decreases further. Borrowing in financial markets costs the railroads more because they represent a greater financial risk.

Even some of the airlines are now on the borderline of what is called debt financing as compared with equity financing. The equity value of their planes and equipment does not cover their debts.

The higher cost of borrowing, of course, serves only to add to the problem of declining net income. (Railroad nets dropped 40 percent between 1955 and 1959.) This is a hard circle to break out of.

Obviously when the railroads in general—and eastern railroads in particular—are having such problems they are no longer the kind of monopolistic octopus that the Interstate Commerce Commission was originally designed to fight. Already some 150 trains have been discontinued, and 9,859 miles of track were abandoned between 1946 and 1959.

But in any solution of the present problem the railroads must remain a key ingredient. In the fields of long distance freight and short distance passenger commuting there are tasks that only the railroad, with its large capacity and unhindered rights-of-way, can perform well.

The Kennedy administration's deferred legislative program would take care of some of the immediate inequities. It reportedly would permit faster tax writeoffs on rail equipment. It would allow tax deferral on reserve funds if these were used within a reasonable period to purchase needed new equipment. It would seek to have State and local tax overloads on railroads reduced.

These are logical steps. They amount to a form of support that does not just subsidize the status quo but aids a sensible modernization.

SUBJECTS CONGRESS OUGHT TO ACT UPON

But in addition a much more far reaching—and delicate—legislative threshold must be crossed if the transportation system of the Nation is to continue an efficient evolution. Congress ought to be asked to take steps covering the following:

Mergers: The lawmakers should instruct the ICC to consider all current merger requests as a whole, making certain that each major region is served by strong, competing systems as a result of mergers. Quite understandably, current mergers tend to involve only matings of the strong and profitable with the strong and profitable. Weak links need to be integrated, too.

Joint routes and rates: Congress should make clear its intent that the ICC use its power to force rail, truck, air, and ship lines to give shippers rates for joint routes. Such a policy strictly enforced might begin to end the rivalries that force shippers to use only one medium of transport when good sense would demand that a shipment start, say, by rail and be transhipped by truck.

Common carriage: When a meatpacker buys his own fleet of delivery trucks and then begins to pick up orders of fruit in them for the return run, private carriage begins to challenge the position of common carriage. Private carriage is not controlled under the strict rate and route decrees that the ICC imposes on common carriers. The result is that unregulated private truck use increased 350 percent between 1946 and 1959.

Common carriage is vital to the Nation's economic health. A balance between private and common carriage must be preserved. Therefore the administration's recommendation that private carriage be placed under some regulation makes sense—if only to assure that ballast runs charge going rates and don't cheat common carriers of business.

MORE VIGOR NEEDED IN RAIL MANAGERMENTS

Transportation companies: The logical next step beyond joint rates and routes is the formation of transportation companies, firms operating trains, trucks, buses, and barges. These would have to be as firmly policed by the ICC as the powerful railroads were early in the century.

They should be allowed to coalesce only where fair competition in the public interest will clearly be preserved. But they seem inevitably a part of the future in an integrated America.

At present there would appear to be few firms ready for such crossbreeding. But Congress should consider instructing the ICC to give them a go-ahead on an experimental basis as soon as any applicant appears.

The Doyle committee report recommends, wisely, that if such a go-ahead is given the combine be licensed for only 3 years. This would permit periodic review to make sure competition is preserved.

Many other steps need to be taken within the transport industry itself. Railroad management needs to be shaken into more vigorous salesmanship and active recruiting of young executives. Labor must cooperate in trimming out unneeded personnel. There is sense in suggestions that major lines set up an independent subsidiary management to deal exclusively with passenger service.

The experience of the North Western, which overhauled its Chicago commuter operation and is now making a profit, is encouraging. So is the determination of Erie-Lackawanna to do the same thing in New York.

Increases in population and business vol-

ume mean that the current overcapacity of American transportation will eventually disappear. But careful research as to the pattern of this growth, plus more forward-looking Government regulations, are needed to prevent the adjustment from being wasteful and costly.

Jersey Meadowlands Owners' Association Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the public works appropriation bill, recently passed by the House, contains a \$50,000 item to study the Passaic River, Hackensack River, Newark Bay, Elizabeth River area in New Jersey. The so-called Jersey Meadows are covered by this worthwhile study. Some of the most potentially valuable land in the world is located here. The titles to many of the privately owned parcels lying in this area have been placed in serious question by New Jersey Superior Court and Appellate Division decisions having to do with the riparian rights of the State to many parcels. The owners of most of the parcels in question have understandably formed an incorporated group, the Meadowlands Owners' Association, for the purpose of protecting their proper interests.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the Record a statement of policy by this association. This policy statement has been sent to me by Donald MacKay of Rutherford, N.J., executive secretary of the association:

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF THE MEADOWLANDS OWNERS' ASSOCIATION, A NONPROFIT CORPORATION

In a memorandum made public August 16, 1961, Mr. Peter J. Gannon, chief of the Bureau of Navigation, Department of Conservation and Economic Development, State of New Jersey, listed 1,078 parcels of meadowlands "in which the State of New Jersey appears to have an interest in title because of tidal waterways."

This list includes meadowlands in North Bergen, Secaucus, and Kearney in Hudson County, and in Carlstadt, Little Ferry, Moonachie, Wood-Ridge, East Rutherford, Rutherford, Lyndhurst, and North Arlington in Bergen County.

The policy of the Meadowlands Owners' Association, according to Donald MacKay, executive secretary, always has been directed toward clearing of titles to lands which have been owned for centuries by private interests, and on which taxes have been paid by many of the present owners for 40 years or more.

This same land was sweetwater land and never inundated by tides. However, in 1911 the Erie Railroad Co., was permitted by the War Department to build a canal connecting Berrys Creek and the Hackensack River. Then in 1915 the New Jersey Mosquito Commission was authorized by the State to eradicate breeding places for mosquitoes, which require fresh water. Deep ditches were dug

in the meadowlands to remove the fresh water. The result was that there was continual flooding of the land at normal high tide. This flooding by tidewater killed off cedar groves and growing hay in the meadowlands.

The State's claims to lands which it has caused to become subject to tidal waters has created a situation which amounts to expropriation of private interests that have endured for centuries. It is hardly the right of any State to flood and drain lands and then claim these lands because they are flooded and drained.

The New Jersey Superior Court and Appellate Division decisions were not based on normal high tide, but on an entirely new concept of 6 inches above normal high tide. Obviously on low level land this difference could encompass a vast acreage.

There is considerable doubt as to whether the meadowlands are flooded by water draining off the upland, or by tidewater. If these lands are only flooded by fresh water, or by a combination of fresh water and tidewater, then the State's claim is invalid. Only if the normal tidewater is above the land is there any authority for the State's position.

Nothing has been done to clarify the situation, although the Meadowlands Owners' Association has urged the Governor, the legislature, and the department of conservation and economic development to clarify the matter.

In reply to a letter from Secretary MacKay, Chief Gannon has agreed to have a topographic or contour survey made of a portion of the meadowlands to determine which are subject to tidal flow. Now the question arises of what bench mark will be used, what elevation above mean sea level will be the criterion? A variation of even a fraction of an inch might affect large acreage.

When it is understood that in the 11 municipalities already affected nearly \$100 million in property is involved, and that there is in the meadowlands a potential of at least 10 times that amount, it can be seen that a very serious situation has arisen.

Although not intending it as such, Chief Gannon has supported the contention of the Meadowlands Owners' Association. In his memorandum he raises the question of what interpolations were made with reference to mean sea level for setting the tide gage at Berrys Creek.

He further says: "The lowlands in between (the ridges east and west of the Hackensack River) becomes a natural drainage area for storm water and other waste water from surrounding municipalities and industries. There also may be springs in the meadowlands."

"The piercing of the meadowlands with mosquito ditches in order to drain off surface water and thus frustrate incubation of mosquitoes is an indication that most sections of the meadowlands were above high tide; if not, why the need of ditches? If these ditches contributed to the general dampness of the area, it would not become State's property because of man-made construction."

"It cannot be generally accepted or agreed that the word 'meadowlands' is tidal lands and thus State property. It has been my experience in the Hackensack meadows area of Jersey City that in the summertime the meadows would be dry, and it was a common occurrence that meadow fires would develop during the summer season when the land and weeds were dry. Yet high tide occurred twice a day."

"However, in rainy seasons or during the winter with snow and rain, the meadowlands would be damp and mushy. This is a further indication that this entire meadowland is a drainage basin for the surrounding countryside."

Address of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, at the 26th Annual National Convention Banquet of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States in Utica, N.Y., August 26, 1961

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day it was my privilege to be present for the annual banquet of the 26th annual convention of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States. In fact I had the honor to be one of the speakers at that banquet.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most forceful and outstanding speakers of the evening, as well as its very able toastmaster was the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Dr. Edward D. Re of New York.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of Dr. Re's outstanding address:

THE SPIRIT OF MOUNT MCKINLEY

(Remarks of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, at the 26th annual national convention banquet of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, convention headquarters, Utica, N.Y., Saturday, August 26, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and honored members of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, it is a great honor and a real privilege for me once again to have the opportunity of addressing this honored patriotic organization of American veterans of Italian extraction. As all of you know, I am not a stranger among you. I bring with me the best wishes of your many friends in New York and Washington for your continued success and well-deserved recognition and prosperity.

At this happy gathering tonight which brings to a close a wonderful convention, it would be difficult to refrain from pointing out the significant contributions of countless Italians to the American way of life down through the years. It would also be difficult to refrain from pointing out the contribution made by Americans of Italian extraction to the Armed Forces to preserve the heritage of this country. And, finally, it would be difficult not to mention the significant advances that this organization itself has made in the past, as well as its present and recent successes in making our total contribution one of ever-increasing importance.

As an American of Italian heritage, ladies and gentlemen, I feel justifiably proud that many Americans of either Italian birth or extraction have made lasting contributions to our American way of life. The extent to which our great Nation has been able to reap the benefits of so many different cultures and heritages and in the process create a heritage of its own—a heritage of freedom, liberty, and equality of opportunity—is truly remarkable.

We are all familiar, from history, with the well-known contributions of great Italians in the fields of art, music, culture, science, and government. Many of us, however, tend to forget that this contribution continues in an ever-flowing stream right up to the present day. I not only refer to the Italian Americans who served this country honorably in the Armed Forces during the great wars. Nor do I refer only to the emergence of great leaders and statesmen in prominent positions in our Government and abroad. Nor do I refer only to the great forward movement of Italians and Americans of Italian extraction in the professions, the arts, and the sciences; or the significant role this very organization tonight has played in these advances.

My remarks tonight, ladies and gentlemen, concern an achievement of a different nature, but one which represents to me, all the same, a historical landmark of equal significance.

Within the past month, something happened in this country which has never happened before. Mount McKinley, the highest mountain peak on the North American continent, and one of the most rugged peaks in the world, was conquered by man. And, yes, it was a team of native Italians, led by an Italian mountaineer, that successfully answered this insuperable challenge.

The physical importance of this feat alone has earned these brave mountain climbers a lasting place in American history. But to my mind, ladies and gentlemen, this conquest of Mount McKinley is also of great symbolic and spiritual meaning. For to me it symbolizes the perseverance, the hard work, the ever striving upward, and the eventual triumph of every Italian—and Italian American—in this country. To me it signifies in present times the spirit of the people, as they move through perilous and difficult times, to a hard-earned and well-deserved eventual victory—a victory of free men in a free nation.

The indomitable spirit displayed by the team which conquered the highest peak in this country has many parallels. It aptly signifies the long struggle of our forefathers to assert and maintain the inalienable and God-given rights embodied in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. For us, it also signifies a new spirit of re-dedication to the principles and freedoms that these documents so solemnly proclaim. They proclaim the American ideal: equality before the law and equality of opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, or creed.

The American ideal—like the lofty crest of Mount McKinley—represents the highest and most noble achievement of this continent. Like the mountain, however, the way of attainment is difficult and calls for great sacrifice. Yet this is the American creed and the cornerstone upon which stands the reality of America's proclamation of equality of opportunity for all. It is this equality of opportunity, ladies and gentlemen, that permits an Italian to climb Mount McKinley, that permits a Negro to attain high office, that permits an American of Italian extraction to be Governor of one of our great States, or any American, regardless of his religious faith, to be President. This is the American heritage. It represents the fulfillment of man's most noble earthly aspirations. It represents the establishment of a country founded upon ideals of freedom and equality. It was the answer of peoples of all races to the hate, bigotry, persecutions and class distinctions of an Old World.

These people did not have a common country or origin. They were not all of the same religious faith, nor did they have a common language. But woven together by common purposes and ideals, they founded

the greatest nation known to history. It was neither race, nor color, nor creed that gave it unity and strength to surmount strife, economic crises and global war. Rather, it was the common ideal and the desire to preserve the American way of life. It was the spirit that conquered mountains.

Yet this American way of life must be a reality for all Americans. No one is to be deprived of the right to live, work, and share the blessing of liberty on account of his race, color, religion, or previous national origin. Untold harm results to our prestige abroad and to our dignity at home if we preach equality and lofty ideals and practice discrimination and bigotry with arrogant indifference or even with pious resignation.

And it is also well to remember that it is by our ideals, and the genuineness of our efforts to attain them, that we are to be judged as a nation, and not by scientific and technological achievements alone. Indeed, the advances of science cannot be regarded as true progress unless they are used to achieve our great national purpose. This purpose scorns both cynicism and despair. It reawakens all Americans to a realization of the spirituality of man and exhorts us to extend to all others those rights and privileges which we ourselves take so easily for granted.

Let us as Americans all strive to conquer prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry as that fateful Italian team strove to conquer the jagged rocks and crevasses of that unconquerable mountain. Let us ascend with our fellows to that higher level. Much ground has already been gained in the onward march toward the attainment of this American goal. Complete and total achievement lies with us. It lies in our hearts and in our willingness to practice the moral principle inherent in the Golden Rule. As creatures of God and as Americans we cannot fail.

Like the climbers of Mount McKinley, we are summoned to extraordinary personal responsibility and sustained effort in the national interest. We are inspired in our struggle against injustice and intolerance.

This is the spirit of Mount McKinley. For us it has a double significance. First, it represents the cornerstone of this country's ideal: equality of opportunity for all. Secondly, it represents the hope and the inspiration that only from perseverance, struggle, and dedication, can we succeed in the attainment of our national goal as Americans.

Once again I congratulate you for your efforts in helping to keep the Italian heritage alive in a wholesome and patriotic way. Your organization helps us live and breathe the spirit of Mount McKinley.

**How Socialized Medicine Works in
Britain**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the following discussion, in the AMA News, of how Britons fare under socialized medicine. Perhaps we had better think carefully before tampering with our own medical system which has provided the best medical care for the most people in the history of man:

BRITONS SHORTCHANGED?

Evidence has been accumulating in bits and pieces in recent years that the people of England have been shortchanged in the quality and quantity of medical services they have been getting from Britain's experiment in socialized medicine.

A considerable amount of this fragmentary evidence has now been pulled together into a single document well worth thoughtful study by every American—particularly Members of Congress who are being pressured to thrust upon this country the beginnings of a similar experiment.

Oxford University Prof. John Jewkes and his wife, Sylvia, are well qualified to judge the benefits and shortcomings of the British National Health Service. Professor Jewkes, whose field is economics, served on Britain's Royal Commission on Remuneration of Doctors and Dentists, and his wife has collaborated with him on a number of published articles on social affairs.

When they suggest, as they do in "The Genesis of the British National Health Service," that the system adopted in England 13 years ago may have "positively hindered the growth of British medical services," their observation merits close attention on this side of the Atlantic.

Those in the United States who are striving with every means at hand to persuade Americans to accept, and to force Congress to adopt, a system of Government-controlled medicine for the aged may argue that this has little to do with this country since nothing so drastic is proposed here.

Americans should not be disarmed. The plotters of Government medicine admit they desperately desire passage of the King bill to create a foundation upon which can be erected a more grandiose scheme than limited medical care for the elderly.

The Jewkes' report, therefore, is both a challenge and a warning to the United States.

The Jewkes concluded that "the average American now has more medical services than the average Briton" and "the gap between the two has been widening" since inception of the National Health Service.

They raise the provocative question: "How, it may be asked, can a medical system which is progressively creating despondency and frustration among the doctors be regarded as fundamentally sound in conception?"

They point out with cogent argument and statistical evidence that socialized medicine has been far from a smashing success if it were designed to eliminate long delays in hospital admissions, to improve and expand hospitals and to effect a more equitable distribution of medical services. Hospital waiting lists have grown more common and larger, no spectacular changes have occurred in distribution of medical services, and few new hospitals have been built.

In addition, the Jewkes observe that medical research in England has been starving, progress in certain kinds of medical education has been discouraged and centralized government control of medical services has resulted in increasing administrative delay and confusion.

There are striking parallels between the United States today and England before socialized medicine which may arouse some suspicion in the minds of thoughtful Americans.

We are told here, for example, that people over 65 are deprived of medical care because they can't pay for it and the Federal Government, therefore, must assume control of medical services for this group.

In England it was argued as justification for imposing the National Health Service scheme that the aged and poor were being deprived of medical care.

The Jewkes recite statistical evidence that this appeal was "far from the truth" in England.

Are the advocates of Government medicine for the aged in this country prepared to prove now with valid, defensible statistics that they are not exaggerating the problem here?

The British Government has engaged in a constant struggle to restrain the people's demand for medical services and what was touted as "the best possible medical service free for all" has emerged into a system more accurately described as "first come, first served."

More and more Britons, according to the evidence presented by the Jewkes, are seeking medical care outside the National Health Service. They say there is no mystery why these people are willing to pay the tab for the National Health Service, which is compulsory, and pay additionally for private care.

These people are simply "ready to make sacrifices in other directions in order to enjoy prompt hospital and specialist treatment, free choice of consultant and private accommodation."

And the Jewkes point out that if there are considerable numbers willing to make this sacrifice, there are even larger numbers of the dissatisfied who are not yet prepared to do so.

The British Medical Journal has taken note of the Jewkes' work. Declaring that it is "a treat to have the fresh opinion of independent minds," the publication adds: "And so the Jewkes come in with a quiet voice and to state some facts in the situation that could be read with benefit by medical men and medical politicians on both sides of the Atlantic."

Finally, this husband-wife team suggests that Britons who boast that the National Health Service is one of the most remarkable ventures in this century may be guilty, as foreign critics say, of "the kind of pre-tentious claim likely to be indulged in by a power which finds its place in the world slipping, does not relish it, and seeks compensation in national daydreaming."

The 30th Armored Division Commended at Smithville, Tenn., Armory Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the remarks which I was privileged to make at the dedication of the new National Guard Armory ceremonies, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

THE 30TH ARMORED DIVISION COMMENDED AT SMITHVILLE, TENN., ARMORY DEDICATION

Thank you General Giles, General Nunnally, Mayor Smith, Judge Foutch, Major Dyer, Captain Wilson, members of the Tennessee National Guard, ladies and gentlemen, my homefolks, and friends, certainly, I am pleased and delighted to be privileged to attend this ceremony and to participate in the dedication of this splendid new armory—the National Guard Armory—of which all are justly proud.

When Major Dyer, Captain Wilson, Sergeant Vickers and others invited me some weeks ago to participate in these dedication ceremonies I anticipated that the Congress would be in adjournment by Labor Day. I thus accepted as I wanted to be in attendance

at this significant occasion. This is indeed a great day and an occasion that many of you—all of us—have looked forward to for a long time.

Today we are not only celebrating an accomplishment, but we are celebrating a victory for the Army National Guard of Tennessee and this means that we are celebrating a victory for everyone in the land.

The action which finally cleared the way for the construction of this armory has been a part of a nationwide struggle, over a period of several years, to prevent the crippling of the National Guard Establishment.

There have been those who have felt that our National Guard units could be cut down and reduced—and that the building of additional armory facilities was not needed, essential or necessary.

We have thus experienced a period of retrenchment—a time when an effort has been made to cut back—to cut down and reduce the home guard.

Our local MP battalion certainly has been in the very midst of this proposed retrenchment. There was a time when some felt that we would lose our local unit by consolidation with another organization.

We have thus won a victory not only for this new armory—but also for the 30th MP Battalion.

It is significant that we are thus dedicating this armory at a time when the effort to reduce the size of the National Guard has been checked and reversed, and at a time when active duty alerts and orders are going to many National Guard units—as our Nation girds itself for an eventuality in the world crisis which has been precipitated by the threat of Communist expansion.

This armory was planned several years ago by those with vision—men who believe in strength and preparedness and in keeping our country strong.

This armory represents the work of many citizens cooperating and working together to bring this armory to Smithville and our county. Certainly, Maj. Bill Dyer, editor of the Smithville Review, and Sgt. Jimmy D. Vickers, unit leader, led the charge that gained for us this armory.

Major Dyer and all the men of his command contracted members of the county court and secured their assurance of cooperation.

They preserved and obtained approval of a matching fund grant from the adjutant general of Tennessee. This called for a similar grant from the National Guard Bureau and cooperation on the Federal level to assure final approval, authorization and appropriations.

Congress appropriated at this time \$45 million for an armory construction program throughout the Nation. Of this amount, only \$15 million was released by the Bureau of the Budget for a limited construction program—the \$30 million remainder was impounded and withheld.

At this time only two National Guard armories were approved for construction in Tennessee—one at Nashville and this one at Smithville.

The combined efforts and cooperation of all citizens at all levels of Government were successful in securing the construction of this splendid and modern facility.

Our city, county, State and Federal officials certainly have performed front-line duty in this cooperative action.

I know that General Nunnally, our State's fine adjutant general, will approve of my giving a full measure of credit to his predecessor, former Adj. Gen. Joe W. Henry, Jr., who gave notable assistance in furthering this armory project at a time when we were trying also to keep and maintain a guard unit here in Smithville.

In a personal way, I want to say that whatever I may have been able to do in

helping to push this project to completion has been indeed a "labor of love."

I am proud and happy to salute, commend and to congratulate the men of the 130th MP Battalion—our local home guard unit—and all the officers and men of the famed 30th Armored Division. I wish every man of this command "Godspeed" in the future as you drill and train and prepare for any and every eventuality on the home-front or wherever you may be called—as you continue your patriotic service to our country.

This armory and the guard unit that maintains its headquarters here are a part—a very significant and important part—of our national strength. We regard this armory and the 130th MP Battalion as a bastion of strength here in our midst in De Kalb County.

This unit is composed of volunteers who exemplify the finest spirit and tradition and patriotism of the Volunteer State of Tennessee.

The officers and men of the 130th MP Battalion are men of the highest sense of duty and patriotism. They are our neighbors and friends and we are proud of them—every man—every member of this unit.

They have won this armory and established for themselves a place in our community as they have won a place in the hearts and affections of all our citizens.

This achievement of this armory in a very real way illustrates what we have been doing in the present session of the Congress. The Congress has completed 8 months of continuous session—now into the ninth month. The Congress has been considering and working on one of the biggest and most extensive legislative programs in more than a decade. In the main, three major buildups are now underway:

1. Buildup of our national strength—national defense; \$46.5 billion has been appropriated for this purpose. This means a bigger Army, a stronger Navy and the most modern and powerful Air Force in any nation's history. It means a bigger Marine Corps and new and modern weapons. It means greater military strength for our country.

2. Buildup of our economic strength—the building of interstate highways, the building of hospitals, great housing programs, great programs of conservation, the building of dams, and defense installations. All these projects are capital investments in America and they strengthen our economy.

3. Buildup of our friends—allies around the world.

We know and recognize now that the Marshall plan in 1948 strengthened Western Europe against communism—and we know today that some form of foreign aid or mutual assistance is necessary. It is a part of our national defense—and defense strategy.

Some aspects of the program have been badly managed and costly, but all recognize that some form of proper assistance to strengthen and help our allies and ourselves is necessary and essential at this time to help stem the tide and halt Communist expansion and aggression.

These are the three big buildups underway.

Certainly our National Guard is a very important part of our defense posture for strength.

The greatest insurance for peace is to remain militarily strong.

We are proud of this great division—the 30th Armored Division. Again, I salute you and congratulate you—all the men of this command. I know that I express the high sentiments of all when I say that we are proud of every man of this command—all volunteer patriots of Tennessee.

As we dedicate this splendid new Armory, let us dedicate it as a symbol of strength—strength at home, strength for our State and strength for the Nation.

It is also appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to a spirit of unity of national purpose and cooperation as we join hands and march forward—each contributing his part to defending, preserving, promoting and perpetuating our freedom and liberty and our cherished American way of life.

Let Us Learn From History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, recorded history can be useful only if we learn its lessons. Man can learn from past experiences and he can better his lot if he guides himself so as to not repeat the mistakes of earlier days.

With that in mind, I urge every American to read the following article which appeared in the September 1961, issue of the National Jewish Monthly published by B'nai Brith.

Dr. Samuel H. Dresner is rabbi of Beth El Temple, Springfield, Mass., the editor of Conservative Judaism, and author of "Prayer, Humility, and Compassion" and several other books. Rabbi Jack Riemer is spiritual leader of Temple Israel, Swampscott, Mass., and a department editor of Conservative Judaism.

The article follows:

THE MAIN REASONS WHY ROME FELL—AND A COMPARISON WITH LIFE TODAY

(By Samuel H. Dresner and Jack Riemer)

In 1787 mankind stood upon the threshold of the new age. In France the first faint rumblings of the French Revolution could already be heard. In England life was beginning to alter its pace and character under the impact of the industrial revolution. And across the seas in America, a new country called the United States was just beginning its rise to power. A spirit of change and excitement was in the air.

In that same year, in London, after 28 years of intensive research, one of the greatest books in the history of scholarship was finished: "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," by Edward Gibbon. Why did Gibbon write it?

Because he wanted to know how it happened that the Roman Empire, which was built to last forever, should have crumbled into the dust—and how it was possible for the empire which had the mightiest army, the wisest legal system, the most powerful organization, the finest roads, and the richest culture of all antiquity, to have collapsed. How had a hoard of barbarian Huns been able to overthrow it? Gibbon wrote this book because he felt he had to know the answer to this question, for the sake of the record, and also for the sake of the new age that was being born. He studied every facet of Roman life. And when he was finished with all his research, he reached this conclusion:

DEFEAT CAME FROM WITHIN

Rome was not defeated by the barbarians. By the time they came, her granite walls had already fallen from inner decay.

And in the last chapter of his fifth volume, Gibbon summarizes his conclusions by listing the five main causes of the collapse of Rome:

1. The first cause was the corruption of its commerce.
2. That led to even a greater degree of corruption and immorality among the civil servants, the military leaders, and the Government officials.
3. The spending of more and more public funds on amusements and luxuries instead of essentials. The public became evermore distracted by the chase after pleasure.
4. The rapid increase in marital infidelity and divorce brought about the destruction of the home and the family as basic units of society.
5. The decay of religion as a serious factor in the lives of the people.

APPEARANCES DECEPTIVE

One hundred and seventy-five years have gone by. The new age, which was just beginning when Gibbon wrote his book, is now in full flower. Let us, therefore, look at this age of ours carefully with an eye on Gibbon's notes, make a few comparisons, and perhaps learn a lesson.

In many ways, our age is far superior to the Roman Empire.

They built roads which stretched for hundreds of miles. We build rockets that reach to the moon.

They had a powerful infantry. We have weapons which make their spears and swords look like toys.

They had circuses at which a hundred thousand people could be entertained at once. We have television stations that can beam out one program to a hundred million people.

And yet, as we read Gibbon's book, and follow in his pages the unhappy description of the gradual decay of the glory that was once Rome, we cannot help but make a comparison between the Roman age and our own.

Gibbon said that the first cause of the collapse of Rome was the corruption of its commerce. How does our society stand in the area of business morality? There is a new book called "The Operator," a study of American business practices. Here are a few typical selections:

According to the U.S. Better Business Bureau, \$5 billion, which is 1 percent of the total national product, changes hands each year in bribes, kickbacks, and payoffs.

According to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, \$2½ billion was collected last year from people who tried to cheat on their income tax. The amount uncollected is astronomical.

According to the U.S. Federal Trade Commission, there have been twice as many actions against companies misrepresenting products in 1956 as in 1950.

The above statements include such famous cases as:

The New Jersey company that tripled its price and then gave 15 percent off.

The Michigan concern which sold second-hand tires as new.

The Pennsylvania gas station that put regular gas into the pumps market premium.

The case of the Swiss watches that were made in Hoboken.

The wonder drug that turned out to be ordinary aspirin.

"The Operator" lists thousands of such cases, cases beyond the law and cases just within the law. It claims, for example, that \$75 million a year is spent in the campus buying advance copies of exams, hiring people to write dissertations, or manufacturing fake academic degrees.

Not long ago the entire country was shaken by the television quiz show scandals. But within a few weeks the shock was over, the country quickly adjusted, a few people were

made public scapegoats, and life went back to normal.

WAS ROME WORSE?

One last example from the book will summarize the moral climate of our society:

Three men were having lunch together in a very good restaurant. When the bill came, each insisted on paying for it.

"I'm in the 80-percent bracket," said one. "It will cost me only 20 percent."

"Don't be foolish," said the second. "I'm in the 100-percent excess profits bracket, and it won't cost me anything."

"I'm on a cost-plus contract," said the third as he picked up the bill. "I'll make money."

Could it have been worse in Rome?

The second factor that brought about the fall of Rome, according to Gibbon, was the corruption of the civil servants, the military leaders, and the Government officials. How does our society stand in this area?

Two events occurred in the past year which were enough to answer the question of how our society rates in public integrity.

In January 1960 the Chicago police scandal broke wide open. Now scandals in Chicago are like the barnacles on a ship: unpleasant, but unnoticed. This one, however, really shook it up. It was revealed that a number of Chicago policemen had planned and participated in hundreds of burglaries, that uniformed patrolmen had served as watchmen and as safecrackers, that the loot had been taken out in squad cars and stored in police stations, and that 175 policemen were involved. To cap the matter, when those accused were brought before the judge, he dismissed the case for insufficient evidence.

In May 1960 the highest government official of the Borough of Manhattan confessed under oath that he had accepted gifts, loans, and favors from a real estate executive who did business with his office. When the real estate man was asked whether he thought he had done anything wrong, his only answer was, "After all, isn't everyone doing it?"

Yes, everyone is doing it. And everyone was doing it in Rome—until the walls fell.

The third factor that undermined Rome, according to Gibbon, was the spending of public money on luxuries instead of essentials. What are the facts today?

The facts are, in terms popularized by John Kenneth Galbraith, that we believe in private luxury and public poverty.

We are fierce balancers of the budget. Every penny must be accounted for and whatever cannot be defended as an absolute necessity is scrapped when it comes to such unimportant commodities as defense, education, public health, city planning and religion—even though the church and synagogue are frightfully understaffed, third-rate teachers staff many public schools, our cities are filthy and transportation poor, and Russia passes us in scientific and military achievement.

But how different is the atmosphere once we turn from public needs to private pleasures. Nothing is too good for us when it comes to our own little joys. We live on a fantastically high economic level, devouring our income through the nonsense which the hidden persuaders make us believe we need. The national average wage of bartenders is twice that of schoolteachers. Americans spend twice as much each year on vacations as they do on schools. The sale of comic books in this country was seven times higher this year than the sale of all textbooks.

Perhaps the best symbol of our times was the sign that I saw at an airport. Northeast Airlines is advertising its new luxury flight to Miami, and its new credit plan. There is a big sign with four words on it: "Enjoy Now—Pay Later."

The fourth factor which Gibbon lists is the breakdown of family life. What is the state of family life in America today? Let me present two facts:

Last year, it is estimated, 1 million illegitimate births occurred in this country.

From 1 to 2 million Americans are estimated by public health authorities to have contracted venereal diseases in 1960—a rise of 72 percent over 1959 and 58 percent over 1958—more than one-fifth of whom were teenagers.

Unbelievable figures, difficult for parents to accept. More unbelievable by far must be the factors that have contributed to a state of affairs so shocking as to challenge the very institutions of marriage and the family, already considerably shaken by the divorce mortality of one out of every three marriages (which does not mean the other two-thirds are successful).

An easy attitude toward sex.

The weakening of basic moral standards.

The impending collapse of family life.

A colleague of ours, in response to an essay question, "What do you want most in life now?" received this answer from the majority of his confirmation class:

"More than anything else we want our parents to join the country club."

The last cause that Gibbon found for the breakdown of Roman society was the failure of religion. When religion degenerated into mere empty form, when it lost its power to serve as a check on the desires of men, when it became a tool for social climbing and an instrument of vanity, Rome was finished.

What is the state of religion in our land today?

In one sense, things have never been so good. More people are joining synagogues and churches today than ever before. Impressive buildings are going up all over the country. It is now socially acceptable, and even socially necessary, to be affiliated with some religious group.

But, if everything else which we have said above, so far, is true, if this is the moral climate which exists in business, government, and home life, then religion has never been weaker than it is today; for religion is evidently unable to serve as a brake on the chase after pleasure, unable to shame the greedy, humble the ambitious, or frighten the arrogant. Religion appears to be too easy, too comfortable, too popular to be of any real help in the moral crises. When the majority of Jews who attend synagogue on the high holidays are rarely seen there the rest of the year, when even leaders of the synagogue can absent themselves the rest of the year and remain leaders, then religion has little power.

What, then, should be the task of religion in our time? The answer, I believe, is found in a comment about Rome found in the Talmud.

Once Rabbi Akiba went with a delegation of five rabbis on a mission to Rome. It was at the beginning of the second century and Rome was still in its full power. His hosts took him on a tour of the city. They showed him their bridges and their bathhouses, their art galleries and their circuses, their museums and their military outposts, their statues and their palaces. Then they said to him proudly:

"Are you impressed?"

Akiba replied: "No." They were shocked.

"When we were walking in the square," Akiba explained, "we saw a splendid statue of the Emperor. And as we went by it began to rain. I saw the slaves who were on duty guarding the statue take velvet robes and cover it so that it would not get wet, and I saw that the slaves were wearing rags. I am not impressed with Rome. For a city in which statues wear robes and human beings wear rags cannot long endure."

This, in one sentence, is the task in religion in our time:

To remind a world gone mad of the true values.

It must prevent America from becoming another Rome.

Keith Worthington's History of Nephi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the community of Nephi, Utah, is making elaborate preparations to celebrate its 110th year of settlement by the early Mormon pioneers later this month.

Nephi is the county seat of Juab County situated on the sloping southwest buttresses of Mount Nebo and is surrounded by dry land wheat ranches and farms.

History records that one David Broadhead, who owned a farm near Nephi, testified in court in the middle 1880's that "of course wheat can be raised without irrigation," and was indicted for perjury. Thereafter, we are told, he returned to his farm, hung up a sign "perjury farm," and for many years was one of the biggest growers of dry land wheat in the State.

But Keith Worthington has done such a splendid job of telling the history of Nephi in a series currently being run in the local newspaper, the Times News, that I refer you today to the earliest articles of the feature:

NEPHI'S 110 YEARS

(By Keith Worthington)

SETTLEMENT OF NEPHI

Introduction: 114 years ago our Mormon pioneers entered the Salt Lake Valley; 110 years ago in September, settlers came to Juab Valley.

Try to imagine what this valley would have looked like in that long ago—no houses, no streets, few trees—no irrigated fields and abundant gardens; no schools, no churches, and few people. Through diaries, journals, records, and stores we get an idea of what it was like. It is to these that I would like to constantly refer to give an idea of what our pioneers had to endure.

As Mormon explorers such as Parley P. Pratt and George A. Smith brought back word of the fertile valleys to the south of Salt Lake and Brigham Young personally visited the valleys, new settlements were soon established, and faithful saints left their comfortable homes in Salt Lake City for further colonization experiences. Nephi in Juab Valley was one of the early areas to be settled. Nephi obtained its name from a Book of Mormon prophet. The name is derived from the Egyptian meaning "good."

In the Sixth General Epistle of the Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, dated September 22, 1851, Brigham Young said:

"We decided on locations for settlement on Salt Creek, in Juab Valley, and Corn Creek in Parowan Valley, between this and Iron County, and companies will leave immediately after conference to form these settlements."

No time was lost in carrying out Brigham's orders, for in the latter part of September the first settlers entered Juab Valley. Charles and Guy Foote, their father, Timothy Bradley Foote, his wife and two other children were the first permanent settlers to arrive at Salt Creek. Next came Levi Gifford. During the month of October 1851, Zimri H. Baxter, Charles Sperry, Charles H. Bryan, William Cazier, John Cazier, Josiah Miller and Israel Hoyt arrived and after looking over the ground, selected building lots, put up five loads of hay and settled down to make Nephi their permanent home. On November 17 of the same year, Isaac Grace Sr. and family, Thomas Tranter and John Davis, enroute to Parowan reached Nephi after an accident to one of their party necessitated a temporary halt. After looking the place over they decided to stay. Thus, we see that there were 17 families that spent the first winter in the little settlement. There were 75 persons, all told.

Joseph L. Heywood had been commissioned to by Brigham Young to lay out the city and with the help of Jesse W. Fox they did this on September 25 and 26, 1852. They laid out a townsite one-half mile square divided into square blocks, and surveyed a field 1 mile long (Journal of Martha Spence Heywood).

The Journal of Martha Spence Heywood, wife of Joseph L., contains a rich history of Nephi. She tells in great detail of the difficulties and uncertainties of that first winter.

"September 23—Wednesday 1851: Arrived here on Monday evening at half past 6 o'clock. Found the brethren on the ground in good spirits—delighted with the valley, had some corrals made. Brother Baxter invited us to supper, of which we partook, and immediately after Mr. Heywood called a meeting to commence the organization of the people. Meeting opened by Father Gifford, after which Mr. Heywood made some appropriate remarks in reference to the necessity of having a watch, as the little property we had in cattle and horses was our all and could not be very well risked and by strictly guarding the settlement in a way it might save a great deal of trouble with the Indians. He called for an expression of the brethren on the subject, a few of which spoke in favor of establishing the watch, whereupon a vote was taken and also a vote appointing Brother Foote the captain of the guard and also to have an oversight in reference to the brethren having firearms and in good order with the privilege of calling them out for examination and drill when he thinks suitable.

"Tuesday we all enjoyed ourselves as new settlers remarkable well and the more the brethren explored the ground the better pleased they were."

On October 3, Sister Heywood recorded the anxiety and fear that filled the hearts of the women who were yet living in wagons in that Indian-inhabited country.

"Friday: Monday morning Brother Baxter started in company with one of the Gifford boys for the canyons to get out some house logs and remain one or more nights. Tuesday Mr. H. and Brother Fox with Theodore started for Sanpete to get lumber and a wagon box made. Also Brother Miller with his company started for the city to be there in time for conference, so that we had but two men and three boys left to take care of us women folks if the Indians should happen this way. Toward night the mail carrier arrived, which strengthened our party."

October 22 she wrote: "Thursday: As a company we are very few indeed, there being only two men, four women, three boys, and three children. If the Indians were known to this our cattle would be in danger."

The first white child born in Nephi was Joseph Neal Heywood, the son of Joseph L. and Martha Spence Heywood. He was born on November 18, 1851. Sister Heywood recorded in her journal, dated January 1, 1852:

"It is now over 2 months since making any record, in which time my darling boy was born on the 18th of November about half past nine forenoon in the wagon. Was first taken sick on the night of the 15th. Suffered much unnecessary pain and distress from taking a wrong position as also from the smallness of the wagon and its openness. Sister Ann, a Gifford, was all the assistance I had and after my sweet one was born was left pretty much to myself, having taken all the care of my baby from the time he was first dressed."

On April 1, 1852, Harriet Ann Grace Pyper, daughter of Isaac and Elizabeth Grace became the second child and the first girl to be born in the little community.

In late November, the Saints were still living in their wagons, but they had a road made into the canyon and were hauling logs out rapidly so that they could build their homes (Journal History of the Church, Nov. 25, 1851, p. 1).

Sister Heywood felt that the brethren were the right kind of people to make a settlement and "with little exception they are united in effort to build up the place."

FIRST BUILDINGS

Individual homes were the first buildings to be constructed in the valley. On December 13, 1861, Joseph L. Heywood wrote the following description of Nephi to the Deseret News:

"About 12 houses have been erected: viz 3 built of adobies, 2 of willows, plastered inside and out, 1 two-story house built of 4-inch plank, and the balance of logs obtained from distance of 10 miles.

"Our roofs and flooring are principally of lumber cut at Hamilton A. Potter's mills, San Pete Valley, distant about 30 miles from Nephi."

By the turn of the new year 18 houses had been constructed, three of adobe, the remainder of logs. The public corral was nearly finished. In a letter from Dr. Willard Richards to Wm. Clayton in April 1852, he states:

"There are several beautiful settlements on the road to this point, among which perhaps, Springville may rank the first, and Nephi the second. At both of these places the spirit of energy and industry is almost without a parallel. All of the houses look clean and neat, fences in good order, and everything shows that saints live there. The city of Nephi was commenced in September last. There are now 20 good homes, a splendid corral for cattle, and a good quantity of land under cultivation."

After the homes, the meetinghouse was built. This was completed in 1852. Not only were religious meetings held here but also school, and many parties and entertainments. This building was located on Main Street where the Nephi City Hall now stands. In 1854 this building was torn down.

In 1853 a small fort was built to protect the settlers from the Indians. The fort occupied the two blocks upon which now stands the Juab County courthouse and the First Security Bank, and extend one block west. Later a larger fort was built that was three blocks square and afforded much greater protection. This will be covered in greater detail later.

In 1854 a titling house was built on the northeast corner of Main and Center Streets, where the present post office stands. This was 30 by 20, three stories high, basement included. The adobes for the outside were made from clay hauled from the bottoms,

some 3 miles distant. This old building was torn down in September 1931 (the Times-News, Sept. 13, 1931).

As the town grew the old social hall was constructed to take care of their needs. This building was located at 170 East Center Street. Many parties, dances, plays, reunions, and just plain fun were had in this old building before it was torn down at the turn of the century.

Nine years after the pioneers first entered Nephi, the Juab Stake Tabernacle (then called Nephi Tabernacle) was begun. This church building was completed and dedicated in 1865. This served as the meeting house for the Nephi Ward and for Stake conferences. Few other buildings were built during this early period.

PIONEER LIFE—EARLY OCCUPATIONS

The chief occupation of the people of Nephi was farming. They raised wheat, oats, barley, and even the first year they produced potatoes, peas, beans, melons, squash, and corn from seeds they had brought with them. Gradually they acquired some livestock. (Nephi centennial jubilee, 1851-1951, p. 8.)

In the spring of 1852, Zimri H. Baxter obtained some apple seedlings from a Salt Lake City nurseryman. In 1855 the grasshoppers robbed the trees of all their leaves and even some of the bark. In 1856 Mr. Baxter replanted all he thought would grow, giving the rest to David Cazier, who succeeded in raising some trees and who was the first to pick apples in the valley (Ibid. p. 9).

In the same year, 1852, Charles Bryan planted some peach stones, but they winter killed, except for a few which produced fruit in the year 1858.

After the Belliston brothers obtained honey in the eighties, the people of Nephi enjoyed honey.

For Juab Valley in Utah territory, the following horticultural statistics were given for the year 1866: 12 acres in apples, 7 acres in peaches, 2 acres in grapes, and 10 acres in currants (Journal History of the Church, Jan. 18, 1868, p. 6).

Even in the very earliest period there were occupations other than agriculture. Apostle Ezra T. Benson and Seth M. Blair, who were making a missionary tour through the southern settlements, visited Nephi and held meetings with the people. Elder Benson writes:

"On the 12th (November 1852) we set out for Nephi, Juab Valley, and reached it about 5 o'clock p.m.; preached in the evening to the saints and had a season of rejoicing; found 26 families of the fall emigration at this point and Nephi begins to extend her borders and assume quite a village appearance and is truly situated in the heart of a valley capable of sustaining thousands. The brethren are erecting a grist mill and a saw mill is much needed" (Journal History, November 1852).

Andrew Love, in referring to this mill, says:

"The new frame grist mill, built by Mr. Joseph Birch, is expected to run in a short time; this mill is situated near the mouth of Salt Creek Canyon; the owner is building as a protection against hostile Indians, around the mill, a stone wall 12 feet high; this fort will in case of an attack from the Indians, be quite a protection, for with long-ranged guns the mouth of Salt Creek Canyon might be guarded" (Journal History, 1859).

Brough says that the above mill was never finished, for at the advice of Brigham Young it was moved into town where it would be more safe against Indian attacks (Franklin Keith Brough, "Freely, I Gave" p. 63).

Love tells of many of the early occupations. Adams, Grace and Baxter were nail manufacturers, and in 1859 he records that their business had grown to such an extent that "they are going to erect more extensive buildings." This same year he records that "Messrs. Gardner and Andrews are putting their saw mills in good order."

In 1863 Love wrote "Among the trades here is a hat shop conducted by Mrs. Job Sidwell. Brother Love also told of the fine nursery that Brother Baxter had started (Andrew Love's Journal)."

In a letter to the Deseret News from Samuel Pitchforth, dated July 23, 1864, he writes:

Mr. John Hague's new grist mill is doing a good business, as also the tannery owned by Messrs. Andrews and Boswell.

In the spring of 1870 William Garrett, a pioneer brickmaker of Davis County, moved his family to Nephi and again engaged in the brickmaking business. He continued this work for 5 years with his sons helping him (the William Garrett family of England, p. 3).

The midwife played a big part in the early days of Nephi. When doctors were scarcely known, midwives were depended upon to see the women "through their difficult time." Mrs. Eliza Chapman Gadd and Gerusha Boswell were two of the earliest ones. Together they brought more than 3,000 babies into the world. A later midwife who has delivered a great number of babies is Ann Leavitt Stephenson.

The telegraph line came through Nephi in 1866, and gave employment to many young fellows of the day. William A. C. Bryan stated that he put the Nephi office to work about Christmas day, 1866. The telegraph office was in the home of Charles H. Bryan, his father. After the "boys on the line" had been working a few months, President Young called on them to take up classes and teach young women the art. Mary Ellen Love Neff reminisced about their training:

"In the summer of 1867 Miss Elizabeth Parkes, Miss Elizabeth Ann Claridge, Miss Hetty Grace and myself were called by the ecclesiastical authorities of the ward to study telegraphy. Our teacher, Wm. A. C. Bryan, had been called to study telegraphy under Professor Clowes. He made a good record and was installed operator in charge of the Nephi Telegraph Office as soon as it was opened in the late fall of 1866.

"We girls had a happy, busy time that summer and enjoyed our study and practice of telegraphy so that the time passed swiftly."

She continues saying that after they learned to be telegraphers they were assigned to various offices, Lizzie Parkes being put in charge of the Nephi Telegraph office. (Susa Young Gates "Memorial to Elizabeth Claridge McCun"; Missionary, Philanthropist Architect, pp. 74-78).

Mr. Bryan was an efficient telegraph operator in Nephi for years, Elizabeth Parkes becoming his wife and first assistant. On October 18, 1844, Mr. Bryan was honored for his early work as a telegraph operator by Western Union, during the Centennial Celebration of the first American telegraph line.

Certainly many other occupations existed such as the cobbler and the blacksmith, but stores and business districts as we know them today were nonexistent in this early pioneer period. It remained for the coming of the railroad to bring about this change.

EARLY GOVERNMENT

During the very early period of Nephi the church was the government. It cared for the

welfare of the saints, gave the necessary leadership, settled the differences, as well as giving spiritual help.

It wasn't until the spring of 1852 that civil government was organized. Joseph L. Heywood, writing to the Deseret News in September 1852, lists the following officers.

Mayor, Josiah Miller. Aldermen: Timothy B. Foote, Charles H. Bryan, John Carter, Isaac Grace. Councilors: Amos Gustin, John Cazier, David Webb, James Crabb, Cleon Elmer, Levi Gifford, Ichabod Gifford, Thomas Tranter, and Miles Miller. Recorder, Assessor, and collector, Z. H. Baxter. Treasurer, Wm. Cazier. Marshal, Israel Hoyt. Supervisor of streets, Charles Sperry.

At first there was very little for the civil authorities to do, for the church had everything well in hand. The gradual transition from church leadership to civil government brought some problems. One such incident occurred in March 1853. Jacob G. Bigler was presiding as bishop of Juab County. Brother Heywood was president of the Nephi Branch. George W. Bradley was probate judge of Juab County, and the city had a full staff of officers with Josiah Miller as mayor. Each of these men had responsibilities over the people. But there were only a few people and soon there were some differences among the officers, particularly Brother Heywood, Judge Bradley, and Bishop Bigler. It was decided that on March 13 a conference would be held in which all the people would vote as to whether they wanted to sustain the present officers. A Brother Sly and a Brother Foote voted against President Heywood and Judge Bradley; some did not vote; but the vast majority voted to sustain the present officers. (Journal of Martha Spence Heywood.)

There were no doubt many misunderstandings, but usually they were settled in a spirit of fair play and without the characteristic rowdiness and lawlessness of most western frontiers. (Brough, p. 66.)

Juab County was organized March 3, 1852, and in 1866 Nephi was designated as the county seat. Nephi City was not incorporated as a municipal corporation until 1889.

Resolution Adopted by the Regular Meeting of the Polish American Congress, Central and Northern New York State District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of the Polish American Congress, central and northern New York State district, held on Sunday, April 30, 1961, in the Polish Community Home, Utica, N.Y., and unanimously ratified at the special meeting of its board of directors, July 30, 1961, in the Polish National Alliance Home, Schenectady, N.Y.:

RESOLUTION OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC., OF CENTRAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK STATE AUGUST 18, 1961

Whereas it is a historical fact that the western borders of Poland included the Rivers Oder and Niese centuries before there was the Bismarck's State of Germany; and

Whereas the German Nazis attacked the western lands of Poland during the fall of 1939 bringing with them the havoc of war; slaughter of human individuals; perpetrating rape on women; robbing; burning and killing and causing other destruction and devastation; and

Whereas the people of Poland throughout their history prove that the predominant purposes of their existence are to worship God, establish freedom, liberty, justice and peace throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That for aforesaid reasons the American Government adopt as part of its foreign policy restoration of the western lands to Poland to the Rivers Oder and Niese; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Governor of the State of New York, the U.S. Senators and Congressmen representing the New York State and the national headquarters of the Polish American Congress.

Reevaluation of Value of Appropriations for Moonshot Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we should be spending our money wisely in the development of the most modern and practical defense weapons, it seems to me Congress should carefully reevaluate the importance of the President's proposal to spend billions in an effort to reach the moon. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune states the case most clearly:

MOONSHOOT

It's too late to do anything about it at this session of Congress, but next year there should be a reconsideration of President Kennedy's moon project.

So far as we can discover, the only technically competent people who believe it is worth what it is expected to cost are those who have been dreaming of a moon shoot for years. Many other scientists whose opinions are entitled to consideration think the stunt, even if it succeeds, is only a stunt and that the Nation will not be rewarded adequately for the enormous outlay.

Of course, no one can say for sure that a landing on the moon and a return to earth will be altogether fruitless. It might yield some knowledge that cannot be obtained through instruments. As a sporting event, it would surpass the world's series, the Kentucky Derby, the professional football championship, the Olympic games, and the Davis Cup finals rolled into one and multiplied by

a hundred. But it would still fall far short of being worth what the achievement would cost if present estimates of between \$10 and \$40 billion are not exceeded.

President Kennedy proposed the excursion to the moon immediately after the first of the Russian orbital flights. He seemed to think that the Russians' achievement would remain in the forefront of men's minds for months and years to come and we were, therefore, justified in going to almost any length to cap their triumph with a far more startling one of our own. Congress agreed and voted \$300 million for a start.

Now, only a few months later, the world has not forgotten the orbital flights but it surely is not obsessed with them as it was for a few days. Khrushchev's resumption of atom bomb testing in the atmosphere is now preoccupying public attention. Tomorrow and next year it will be something else.

There are other and better ways of demonstrating that this is a great nation than by sending an expedition to the moon at staggering costs.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semi-monthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. Arrangement of the daily Record.—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. Type and style.—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. Return of manuscript.—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. Tabular matter.—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. Proof furnished.—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. Notation of withheld remarks.—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. — addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. Thirty-day limit.—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. Corrections.—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). Appendix to daily Record.—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). Makeup of the Appendix.—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so

that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. Estimate of cost.—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. Official Reporters.—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).